federal register

Wednesday
November 26, 1980

Part VI

Environmental Protection Agency

Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources: Beverage Can Surface Coating Industry

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 60

[AD FRL-1534-1]

Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources; Beverage Can Surface Coating Industry

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Proposed rule and notice of public hearing.

SUMMARY: The proposed standards would limit emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOC) from new, modified, and reconstructed beverage can surface coating operations. The proposed standards would limit VOC emissions from beverage can surface coating to those resulting from the use of waterborne coatings.

The standards implement Section 111 of the Clean Air Act and are based on the Administrator's determination that surface coating operations within beverage can manufacturing plants contribute significantly to air pollution that may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare. The intent is to require new, modified, and reconstructed beverage can surface coating operations to use the best demonstrated system of continuous emission reduction, considering costs, nonair quality health, and environmental and energy impacts.

DATE: *Comments:* Comments must be received on or before February 5, 1981.

Public Hearing: A public hearing will be held on January 6, 1981 beginning at 9:00 a.m.

Request to Speak at Hearing. Persons wishing to present oral testimony must contact EPA by December 30, 1980.

ADDRESSES: *Comments:* Comments should be submitted (in duplicate if possible) to Central Docket Section (A-130), Attention: Docket Number A-80-4, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, D.C. 20460.

Public Hearing: The public hearing will be held at EPA Environmental Research Center Auditoruim (ERC), Research Triangle Park, North Carolina. Persons wishing to present oral testimony should notify Ms. Deanna Tilley, Standards Development Branch (MD-13), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711, telephone number (919) 541-5477.

Background Information Document. The background Information Document (BID) for the proposed standards may be obtained from the U.S. EPA Library (MD-35), Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711, telephone number (919) 541-2777. Please refer to *Beverage Can Surface Coating Operations, Background Information for Proposed Standards,* EPA-450/3-80-036a.

Docket. Docket No. A-80-4, which contains supporting information used in developing the proposed standards, is available for public inspection and copying between 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, at EPA's Central Docket Section, West Tower Lobby, Gallery 1, Waterside Mall, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, D.C. 20460. A reasonable fee may be charged for coping.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Gene Smith, Standards Development Branch, Emission Standards and Engineering Division (MD-13), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27711, telephone number (919) 541-5477.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Proposed Standards

The proposed standards would apply to all new, modified, and reconstructed beverage can surface coating operations. The proposed standards define a beverage can as any two-piece steel or aluminum container or any three-piece steel container in which soft drinks or beer (including malt liquors) are packaged. Containers in which fruit or vegetable juices are packaged are excluded. Existing facilities would not be subject to the standards unless they undergo a modification or reconstruction as defined in 40 CFR 60.14 or 60.15. The standards would limit VOC emissions from the surface coating of two-piece beverage cans to 0.29 kilogram of VOC per litre of coating solids from each exterior base coating operation except clear base coating, 0.46 kg of VOC per litre of coating solids from each overvarnish coating operation and each clear base coating operation, and 0.89 kg of VOC per litre of coating solids from each inside spray coating operation. VOC emissions from the surface coating of three-piece cans would be limited to 0.50 kg of VOC per litre of coating solids from each exterior base coat operation, 0.50 kg of VOC per litre of coating solids from each interior base coat operation, 0.46 kg of VOC per litre of coating solids from each overvarnish coating operation, and 0.64 kb of VOC per litre of coating solids from each inside spray-coating operation. VOC emissions from the surface coating of metal sheets for steel or aluminum ends would be limited to 0.50 kg of VOC per litre of coating solids from each interior coating operation and 0.50 kg of VOC per litre of coating solids from each exterior coating operation. Each affected facility would consist of a coating application station, flashoff area, and curing oven.

The proposed emission limits are based on the emission levels obtainable through the use of best available waterborne coatings. The standards could also be achieved through the use of solvent-borne coatings in combination with an emission control system.

The performance test specified in the proposed standards requires the calculation of a volume-weighted average of the mass of VOC per volume of coating solids used each calendar month for each affected facility. Procedures for making these calculations are included in the proposed standards. Data on VOC and coating solids content, density, and volume of each of the coatings used, and volume and density of each diluent VOC used for each affected facility during each calendar month are necessary in conducting the monthly performance tests. Information provided by coating manufacturers, or analysis performed using Reference Method 24, is the source of coating formulation data. Coating and diluent VOC consumption data are obtained from the owner's or operator's records. Reference Method 25 would be used to determine the percentage reduction of VOC emissions achieved through the use of an emission control device. Both reference methods are promulgated in the **Federal Register** of October 3, 1980 (45 FR 65956).

The performance test and compliance provisions include procedures for conducting the performance test when only coatings with VOC content equal to or less than the proposed emission limiktations are used, when some coatings with VOC content greater than proposed emission limitations are used, and when a capture system and a control device are required for compliance.

An affected facility is in compliance when the volume-weighted average mass of VOC per volume of coating solids applied, calculated on a calendar month basis, is equal to or less than the proposed emission limitations.

The proposed standards would specify monitoring requirements only when a capture system and emission control device are used to comply with the proposed standards. For incineration systems the proposed standards require continuous monitoring of incinerator temperatures.

The proposed standards would require that the owner or operator

maintain at the source for a period of at least two years records of all data, calculations, and test results necessary to support the calculations of volume-weighted average of the total mass of VOC per volume of coating solids used in each calendar month for each affected facility.

The proposed standards would require reporting the results of the initial performance test and thereafter reporting each month in which an affected facility is not in compliance, by the tenth day of the following month. Affected facilities using a capture system and an incinerator would be required to report, quarterly, all periods during which the average temperature, while can are being processed, is significantly below the average temperature of the device during the most recent performance test.

Summary of Environmental, Energy, and Economic Impacts

Environmental, energy, and economic impacts of standards of performance are normally expressed as incremental differences between the impacts from a facility complying with the proposed standard and the impacts for a facility complying with a typical State Implementation Plan (SIP) emission standard. In beverage can surface coating operations, the incremental differences will depend, in some cases, on the control levels required by revised SIPs. Revision to most SIPs are currently in progress.

Many existing beverage can surface coating operations are located in areas that are considered nonattainment areas for purposes of achieving the National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for ozone. New facilities are expected to locate in similar areas. In revising their SIPs, most States are expected to use the Control Technique Guideline (CTG) document, *Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Existing Stationary Sources, Volume II: Surface Coating of Cans, Coils, Paper, Fabrics, Automobiles, and Light-Duty Trucks* (EPA–450/2–77–088 [CTG]). Therefore, the incremental impacts are measured from the CTG-recommended emission levels.

The environmental, energy, and economic impacts of the proposed standards are based on the anticipated growth of the industry discussed in Chapter 7 of the Background Information Document. Other projections exist that would change the impact assessments. For example, some industry sources project the demise of the three-piece beverage can over the next five years. Others indicate that while use of three-piece beverage cans will drop, they will still represent a significant share of the market. The latter projection was used in assessing the impact of the proposed standards.

In addition to achieving reductions in emissions beyond that required by a typical SIP, standards of performance have other benefits. They establish a degree of national uniformity to avoid situations in which some States may attract industries by having less stringent air pollution standards relative to other States. Standards of performance also improve the efficiency of case-by-case determinations of best available control technology (BACT) for new facilities locating in attainment areas and of lowest achievable emission rates (LAER) for new facilities locating in nonattainment areas, by providing a starting point for the basis of these determinations. This results from the process for developing standards of performance, which involves a comprehensive analysis of alternative emission control methods. Detailed cost and economic analyses of various regulatory alternatives are presented in the supporting documents.

The proposed standards would reduce VOC emissions by approximately 32 percent from the CTG baseline emission level. For plants coating two-piece beverage cans, the proposed standard would result in a 47-percent reduction in VOC emission from the exterior base coat operation, a 15 percent emission reduction from the overvarnish coating operation, and a 26-percent emission reduction from the inside spray coating operation. For plants coating three-piece beverage cans, VOC emissions from the exterior base coat operation would be reduced by 8 percent. Emissions from the interior base coat operation, overvarnish coating operation, and inside spray coating operation would be reduced by 5, 13, and 82 percent, respectively. VOC emissions from the exterior and interior coating operation for steel or aluminum end sheets would be reduced by 2 and 60 percent, respectively. Annual nationwide VOC emissions would be reduced by about 4,800 Mg (5,280 tons) by 1986.

Little or no incremental water pollution impact from new, modified, or reconstructed beverage can surface coating operations would result from implementation of the proposed standards. In addition, those plants discharging toxic pollutants listed under Section 307 of the Water Act could be subject to pretreatment requirements also under development.

The proposed standards would also have little or no incremental solid waste impact.

Based on industry growth projections, application of the proposed standards would result in a net energy reduction of about 36,000 gigajoules in 1985. The net energy reductions result from the use of less coating per can because of higher solids content of the waterborne coatings upon which the standards are based.

The proposed standards are expected to have little economic impact on the beverage can industry. The proposed standards contain at least one control option for each affected facility whose cost is equal to or less than the cost of compliance with the baseline level of control.

Rationale

Selection of Source

Industrial coating operations are a significant source of VOC emissions, accounting for about 2 million Mg of VOC each year. Beverage can surface coating operations are among the largest individual operations producing VOC emissions in the industrial coating category, contributing an estimated 77,000 Mg of VOC emissions in 1977. This represents about 4 percent of total VOC emissions from all industrial surface coating operations.

Studies have been conducted to investigate the effect standards of performance would have on nationwide VOC emissions from stationary sources. Can surface coating operations are ranked second on a list of 59 sources considered for control, published August 21, 1979 (44 FR 49222). Beverage cans represent over half of the can production in the United States today and are the fastest growing segment of the can industry, with a projected annual growth of 5.5 percent. Food cans have shown a slight decline in shipments between 1976 and 1979. Projected annual growth through 1990 is estimated to be less than 1 percent. Little, if any, modification or reconstruction of food can plants is expected during this period. Food cans are predominately three-piece. As the two-piece can captures a greater share of the beverage market, three-piece capacity now used for beverage cans will become available for the manufacture of food cans. This increased availability should reduce the requirements for upgrading food can lines and the number of facilities that would be subject to the modification and reconstruction provisions of 40 CFR 60. Consequently, food cans are not included in the proposed standards. Should the situation change, consideration will be given to the development of standards for food cans.

VOC are the major air pollutants emitted from beverage can surface coating operations and result primarily from the use of organic solvents. Particulate matter generated from this surface coating process is minimal. Technology is currently available to reduce VOC emissions from beverage can surface coating operations. The use of waterborne coatings, the use of solvent-borne coatings coupled with an add-on emission control device, or the use of other control options would reduce VOC emissions by approximately 32 percent from all new, modified and reconstructed sources. Consequently, beverage can surface coating operations have been selected for the development of a new source standard of performance.

Selection of Pollutant

Volatile organic compounds are the primary air pollutants emitted from beverage can surace coating operations. Although some can coating operations may emit particulate matter, the quantity generated is not significant. VOC are defined as any organic compound which participates in atmospheric photochemical reactions, or which is measured by a reference method, or which is determined by procedures specified under any subpart. Photochemical oxidants result in a variety of adverse impacts on health and welfare, including impaired respiratory function, eye irritation, necrosis of plant tissue, and deterioration of some synthetic materials. Further information of these effects can be found in the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) document entitled *Air Quality Criteria for Ozone and Other Photochemical Oxidants* (EPA–600/8–78–004). Therefore, only VOC were selected for inclusion in the proposed standards.

Sources of VOC Emissions at Beverage Can Plants

In beverage can surface coating operations, VOC emissions result from the use of coatings containing organic solvents that evaporate during the drying process. For the purpose of establishing standards and determining compliance, all VOC contained in a coating are assumed to evapoate during the coating process. Industry estimates that well over 90 percent of the VOC consistently evaporates during the coating process. Therefore, this assumption is considered to be valid. VOC content of coatings are generally specified by the coating supplier and calculated by a material balance of the coating ingredients. Manufacturers of beverage cans employ a wide variety of coatings to protect the contents of the can and to protect the beverage can from the environment. Typical coatings applied to beverage cans include expoxies, epoxy-acrylics, acrylics, and polyester enamels. These coatings generally contain organic solvents such as ketones, esters, ethers, and aromatics.

Surface coatings are applied to beverage cans in a series of operations, depending on the type can to be manufactured. In the manufacture of two-piece cans, surface coatings are usually applied to beverage can bodies in three steps: (1) application of an exterior base coat, (2) application of an overvarnish coating, and (3) application of an inside spray coating. Each coating operation is followed by an oven cure, except where radiation-curable overvarnish coatings are applied. A coating may be applied to the exterior bottom of the can either as part of the overvarnish coating or inside spray coating operation. Two coats of inside spray are usually applied to steel two-piece cans, while aluminum two-piece cans usually require only one inside spray coat. The two inside spray coats for steel two-piece cans may be applied wet-on-wet or with an intervening oven cure. Aluminum ends for two-piece cans are formed from precoated metal coils or sheets. When made from precoated coals, the only operation resulting in VOC emission at the beverage can line is the application of end-sealing compound. In the production of three-piece cans, coating operations include the sequential application of an interior base coat, an exterior base coat, and an overvarnish coating to the steel sheets from which beverage can bodies are formed. After formation of the can body, the seam is protected by an inside and outside seam coating. The formed can is then coated with an inside spray. Interior and exterior coatings are also applied to the stock from which the steel ends used in the manufacture of three-piece cans are formed and from which aluminum ends used with three-piece and two-piece cans are formed. End-sealing compound is applied to the formed ends.

Except for inside spray operations for two-piece and three-piece beverage cans, transfer efficiencies approaching 100 percent are achieved. For inside spray operations transfer efficiencies of at least 90 percent are consistently achieved. Transfer efficiency is defined as the ratio of the amount of coating solids adhering to the coated surface to the amount of coating solids consumed. Because of the high and consistent transfer efficiencies experienced in beverage can surface coating operations, it was not deemed necessary to explicitly consider this parameter in the compliance procedures. However 90 percent transfer efficiencies were used in estimating emissions from inside spray.

Data provided by the Can Manufacturers Institute (CMI) indicate that VOC emissions from 1976 coating operations for both two-piece and three-piece cans were distributed in the following manner. Base coating operations accounted for 39 percent of total VOC emissions; overvarnish coating operations for 4 percent, inside spray operations for 38 percent, and end-sealing operations for 10 percent of total VOC emissions. The application of side seam coatings to three-pice cans accounted for 4 percent of total VOC emissions from surface coating operations. Analysis of the CMI data indicates that VOC emissions from miscellaneous sources, such as cleanup operations and the storage or handling of coatings and solvents, accounted for approximately 5 percent total VOC emissions.

Based on information contained in the permit application for a newly constructed two-piece beverage can plant using waterborne coating, distribution of emissions is estimated to be 10 percent from exterior base coat operations, 19 percent from lithography/overvarnish application, 1 percent from bottom-end coating, 55 percent from inside spray operations and 15 percent from the application of end-sealing compound to aluminum ends.

Data for a three-piece beverage can facility applying solvent-borne coatings without add-on controls indicate that the experior and interior base coat operation account for 48 percent (24 percent for each operation) of total plant VOC emissions. Another 15 percent is attributed to the overvarnish coating operation, and 15 percent is also generated from the inside spray coating operation. End-sealing operations account for 20 percent of total VOC emissions from the plant. The application of side-seam coatings account for only 2 percent of VOC emissions.

Analysis of each emission source resulted in the exclusion from the proposed standards of side-seam coating operations for three-piece cans, bottom-coating operations for two-piece cans, misscellaneous VOC emission source (cleanup operations and storage or handling of coatings and solvents) and end sealing operations. VOC emissions from side-seaming operations for three-piece cans account for 2 to 4 percent of total plant emissions.

Emissions from bottom-coating operations for two-piece cans are estimated to be about 1 percent of all VOC emissions from two-piece can lines. While emissions from cleanup operations are potentially significant where solvent-borne coatings are used, their significance has decreased and will continue to decrease as waterborne coatings replace solvent-borne coatings. Emissions from the storage and handling of coatings and solvents are considered negligible because of the wide use of sealed containers or closed coating circulation systems. While low-solvent end-sealing compounds that meet or exceed the CTG requirements are being tested, requisite qualification testing has not been accomplished. For this reason, emissions from the application of end-sealing compounds are excluded from the standards at this time.

Selection of Affected Facilities

The choice of the affected facility for this standard is based on the Agency's interpretation of Section 111 the Act, and judicial construction of its meaning.[1] Under Section 111, the NSPS must apply to "new sources;" "source" is defnied as "any building, structure, facility, or installation which emits or may emit any air pollutant" [Section 111(a)(3)]. Most industrial plants, however, consist or numerous pieces or groups of equipment which emit air pollutants, and which might be viewed as "sources." EPA therefore uses the term "affected facility" to designate the equipment, within a particular kind of plant, which is chosen as the "source" covered by a given standard.

In choosing the affected facility, EPA must decide which pieces or groups of equipment are the appropriate units for separate emission standards in the particular industrial context involved. The Agency must do this by examining the situation in light of the terms and purpose of Section 111. One major consideration in this examination is that the use of a narrower definition results in bringing replacement equipment under the NSPS sooner; if, for example, an entire plant were designated as the affected facility, no part of the plant would be covered by the standard unless the plant as a whole is "modified." If, on the other hand, each piece of equipment is designated as the affected facility, then as each piece is replaced, the replacement piece will be a new source subject to the standard. Since the purpose of Section 111 is to minimize emissions by the application of the best demonstrated control technology (considering cost, other health and environmental effects, and energy requirements) at all new and modified sources, there is a presumption that a narrower designation of the affected facility is proper. This ensures that new emission sources within plants will be brought under the coverage of the standards as they are installed. This presumption can be overcome, however, if the Agency concludes that the relevant statutory factors (technical feasibility, cost, energy, and other environmental impacts) point to a broader definition. The application of these factors is discussed below.

Four alternatives for the designation of an affected facility were considered in the development of the proposed standards. These alternatives include (1) designation of specific equipment such as the coating application station, flashoff area, and curing oven as separate affected facilities; (2) designation of each coating operation as an affected facility; (3) designation of an entire surface coating line as an affected facility; and (4) designation of the entire plant as the affected facility.

If each emission point (specific coating equipment) were designated as a separate affected facility, separate emission limits would have to be prescribed for each piece of equipment. However, each component of a coating operation is so closely linked, both physically and operationally, that separate emission limits for each piece of equipment would present technical and economic burdens on the plant owner or operator. In the manufacture of beverage cans, a coater and associated flashoff area and curing oven may be used to apply different types of coatings, each having a different allowable emission level, e.g., clear and pigmented base coat for two-piece cans or three-piece steel sheets. Designation of the emission points as the affected facility would require that the standards be based on either the highest VOC content coating that could be used or on an industry average of VOC content. This would penalize coaters that, for reasons of product performance, must use a coating with an above-average VOC content. In addition enforcement would be difficult because of the measurement problems associated with isolating the VOC emissions from each piece of equipment.

Treating an entire can line or an entire plant—multiple can lines—as an affected facility has the advantage of providing flexibility in approaches to compliance and ease of enforcement. It has the disadvantage of permitting compliance by the elimination of one or more coating steps and associated emissions without requiring the remaining operations to employ the best system of continuous emission reduction. Also, designation of an entire plant or line as an affected facility would require a much higher capital expenditure to trigger reconstruction considerations. A modification or reconstruction to any part of an existing line or plant could subject the entire surface coating operation (or the entire line or plant) to the provisions of the proposed standard.

Designating each coating operation as an affected facility would simplify enforcement and recordkeeping requirements. Although the equipment comprising each coating operation is closely associated, VOC emissions from coatings used in each operation can be readily separated for the purposes of enforcement and recordkeeping. In addition, the impact of modification and reconstruction provisions is considered more reasonable, as compared to the designation of the entire line or plant as the affected facility. A modification or reconstruction to an individual existing coating operation would not subject all other coating operations on the line or in the plant to the provisions of the proposed standards. Defining each coating operation as including all VOC emissions generated from the application of the coating through the curing process would ensure that the best system of continous emission reduction will be applied to all coating operations. Designation of a coating operation, e.g., equipment and coating, would accommodate situations in which the same equipment is used to apply different types of coatings, each having a different allowable emission level. While such a designation would result in additional affected facilities, no specific enforcement problems would result because coating usage and production data at the plant level are maintained from each type of coating.

The following coating operations have been selected as the affected facilities for control by the proposed standards, because these coating operations account for the bulk of VOC emissions from the beverage can surface coating process, and because control techniques exist for reducing VOC emissions from these operations.

For the manufacture of two-piece beverage cans, the affected facilities are each exterior base coat operation, overvarnish coating operation, and inside spray-coating operation. For the manufacture of three-piece beverage cans, the affected facilities would include each exterior base coat

[1] The most important case is *ASARCO, Inc.* v. *EPA*, 578 F.2d 319 (D.C. Cir. 1978).

operation, interior base coat operation, overvarnish coating operation, inside spray coating operation, and each interior and exterior coating operation for steel ends. For the manufacture of two- or three-piece beverage cans, each interior and exterior aluminum-end sheet coating operation would also be designated as affected facilities.

Selection of Basis of Proposed Standards

Emission control techniques

Two general emission control techniques have been identified as demonstrated emission reduction systems for beverage can surface coating operations: (1) low VOC content coatings, and (2) solvent-borne coating systems with emissions capture and control devices.

Elimination of the exterior base coat was also considered; however, this approach was rejected because it is not applicable to all beverage can surface coating operations. Numerous exceptions would be required, especially for merchant can plants, with each plant requiring a separate analysis. In some instances, base coats are required to provide corrosion resistance, especially where the packaged product is shipped by water transportation or stored in high-temperature, high-humidity areas. Elimination of a coating, however, is not precluded as a means of compliance with the proposed emission limitations if the owner or operator can use this option to meet the proposed emission limit for that operation.

Low VOC content coatings. Low VOC content coatings applicable to the can industry include waterborne materials, no-varnish ink, and UV-curable overvarish. Waterborne coatings have been demonstrated in the beverage can industry for all coating operations with the exception of end-sealing compounds. Research and development on water-based end sealants is being actively pursued. Discussions with vendors and canmakers indicate that acceptable water-based end-sealants will be available and demonstrated within two years.

VOC emissions from waterborne coatings (or other type coatings) are dependent on the solvent-to-solids ratio of the coating, thickness of film applied, units produced per hour, and the surface area of each unit. A variety of waterborne coatings is available. VOC content of waterborne coatings obtained from coating and beverage can manufacturers are summarized in Chapter 4 and Appendix C of the BID. For comparative purposes, equivalent VOC contents expressed as kg per litre of coating less water are also included in the BID. Discussions with the industry and examination of the literature indicate that the trend in beverage can surface coating is toward the use of waterborne coatings. With few exceptions, beverage can manufacturers either have converted or are in the process of converting from solvent-borne coatings to waterborne because of ease of control and cost considerations. All major canmakers, both merchant and capture, have reported plans to convert existing solvent-borne lines to waterborne, and indicate that all future facilities will use waterborne coatings.

No-varnish inks are specially formulated inks which cure with gloss and scuff resistance properties that, in some cases, eliminate the need for an overvarnish coating. The elimination of a coating step results in a decrease in solvent emissions from that operation to zero. However, cans made with no-varnish inks may not provide the corrosion resistance required when the filled cans are stored in high-humidity, high-temperature environments, or shipped by water transportation. Also, the use of no-varnish inks may not provide the mobility required in some existing filling lines. In these cases, beverage-can surface coaters may choose to apply an over-varnish coating. During the past year the use of no-varnish inks has dropped dramatically. One merchant canmaker reports a drop from 80 percent in 1979 to 5 percent in early 1980.

The use of ultraviolet (UV) curing has received a great deal of attention in recent years. UV curing is a radiation-initiated polymerization process for curing industrial finishes and printing inks. This technology has been used for "drying" inks applied in the can and packaging industries, and for curing fillers and coatings in the plywood and particle-board industry. In the beverage can industry, UV curing is used with specially prepared inks and to a lesser extent with overvarnishes for both two-piece and three-piece cans. UV-curable materials essentially contain no VOC. Emissions are relatively insignificant and result only from polymerization that occurs during the curing process. However, the use of UV curing is not applicable to all beverage can surface coating operations and, in fact, the trend is away from their use.

While high-solids coatings (approximately 80-percent solids), powder coatings, and coatings that can be applied by electrodeposition are in use for some industrial surface coating operations, their use in the beverage can industry is still in the experimental stage.

Emission control systems. Although carbon adsorption has been used to control VOC emissions from some industrial processes, its effectiveness on beverage can surface coating operations has not been demonstrated. The opinion of the beverage can industry is that carbon adsorption could be used to control VOC emissions, but that it would be prohibitively expensive because of the high temperatures of the gas stream to be controlled. The gas streams would have to be cooled several hundred degrees prior to entering the adsorption unit. This would necessitate an elaborate and energy-intensive cooling system. However, should the use of carbon adsorption become applicable to the industry in coming years, its use would not be precluded and provisions for determining compliance are included in the proposed standards.

The only emission control system that has been demonstrated as effectively controlling VOC emissions from beverage can surface coating operations is incineration. Both thermal and catalytic incinerators have been used successfully with solvent-borne coatings on both two-piece and three-piece beverage can lines. Thermal incinerators can achieve at least a 90 percent reduction in VOC emissions when operated at a temperature of about 750° C (1,400° F). However, large amounts of supplemental fuel may be required to raise the exhaust gases to incineration temperature. If heat recovery units are installed with the incinerator, the energy consumption may be reduced. Where control is required, the increasing cost of natural gas is driving the industry towards the use of waterborne coatings.

Catalytic incinerators are also capable of achieving VOC emission reductions in excess of 90 percent. Their use requires substantially less energy than the thermal incinerator because of the lower incineration temperature. If heat recovery is used in conjunction with the catalytic units, they become more attractive economically. However, there are restrictions on the applicability of catalytic incinerators because many of the coatings used in beverage can industry contain components that may foul or mask the catalyst. This may greatly reduce the active catalyst life, resulting in higher incinerator operating costs. Consequently, the use of catalytic incinerators is normally limited to those plants that use only a few different coating formulations with ingredients that do not have an adverse effect on the catalyst.

Regulatory alternatives

Based on the analysis of beverage can surface coating emission sources and pollutants, and with consideration of the environmental, energy, and economic impacts resulting from application of the control technology discussed above, three regulatory alternatives were selected for consideration. While the use of solvent-borne coating and appropriate emission control systems is an available control option, the trend in the industry is toward the use of waterborne coatings. With few exceptions, can plants constructed in the past five years use waterborne coatings. One canmaker who constructed solvent-borne lines within the past five years has recently announced plans to convert to waterborne coatings because of increasing energy costs. In addition, practically all major beverage can makers have either converted existing solvent-borne lines to waterborne or are in the process of doing so. Because of the industry trend to waterborne coatings, primarily because of energy considerations, the regulatory alternatives emphasize the use of best available waterborne coatings. However, for those operations where waterborne coatings may not provide the desired coating finish, some manufacturers may choose to use solvent-borne coatings in combination with thermal or catalytic incineration. This option is not precluded under the regulatory alternatives as long as equivalent emissions are equal to or less than those attainable from the use of waterborne coatings.

Regulatory Alternative I is to forego development of a New Source Performance Standard (NSPS) for beverage can surface coating operations. Under this alternative, emissions from beverage can plants would be controlled by State Implementation Plans (SIPs). Existing beverage can plants located in ozone nonattainment areas woud be subject to emission limitations based on recommendations in the control technique guideline (CTG) document for beverage can surface coating operations. New plants located in ozone nonattainment areas would be required to limit emissions to the lowest achievable emission rate (LAER) and new plants in attainment areas to best available control technology (BACT). The emission limits recommended in the CTG were based on the use of the best waterborne coatings available at that time. Since publication of the CTG, waterborne coatings with lower VOC content have been developed and commercialized.

Regulatory Alternative II is based on emission levels that would result from the use of best available waterborne coatings for all coating operations and water-based materials for end-sealing operations.

Regulatory Alternative III is identical to Regulatory Alternative II with the exception that no-varnish inks or UV-curable overvarnishes would be required in lieu of waterborne coatings for overvarnish coating operations.

Environmental impact

The environmental impact of each regulatory alternative was computed as the VOC emission reduction that would be achieved relative to the emissions allowed under State regulations based on the recommended CTG limits.

Regulatory Alternative I (no NSPS) is the baseline. The current level of VOC emissions from existing plants would be maintained, and new plants would be required to meet the same emission limits.

The implementation of Regulatory Alternative II (waterborne coatings) would result in an overall VOC emission reduction of about 4,800 Mg per year in the fifth year of applicability of the proposed standard, a 32 percent reduction from Regulatory Alternative I for new facilities. Specifically, VOC emissions from two-piece beverage can surface coating operations (exterior base coat, overvarnish coating and inside spray coating) would be reduced by 4,100 Mg in the fifth year, a 32 percent decrease from the baseline level of emissions. VOC emissions from three-piece beverage can sheet coating operations (interior base coat, exterior base coat, and overvarnish coatings) would be reduced by 54 Mg, an 8 percent reduction from the baseline emissions. VOC emissions from inside spray operations for three-piece cans would be reduced by 310 Mg in the fifth year, a reduction of 52 percent from the baseline. Emissions from the interior and exterior coatings applied to the sheets from which aluminum or steel ends are formed would be reduced by 333 Mg, a 52 percent decrease from the baseline.

The application of Regulatory Alternative III (waterborne coatings in combination with no-varnish inks or UV-curable overvarnish coatings) would result in a VOC emission reduction of about 6,200 Mg per year in the fifth year, as compared to the baseline. VOC emissions from two-piece can-coating operations would be reduced by 5,400 Mg in the fifth year, a 42 percent reduction from baseline. VOC emissions from three-piece can sheet-coating operations (interior, exterior, and overvarnish coatings) would be reduced by 150 Mg in the fifth year, a 23 percent reduction from the baseline. Emissions from the inside spray coating operation would be reduced by 311 Mg, the same reduction that would be achieved by Regulatory Alternative II. VOC emissions from the coating of steel or aluminum sheet stock for ends reduced by 333 Mg., the same reduction that would be achieved by Regulatory Alternative II.

No impact on water pollution, solid waste disposal, or noise pollution as compared to baseline levels is expected to occur from either Regulatory Alternative II or III.

Energy impact

The application of can coatings requires energy in the form of electricity, natural gas and, in some instances, other fossil fuels. Electricity is used to power coating equipment, sheet and can conveyors, ventilating blowers at the coater and flashoff areas, oven circulating and exhaust blowers, and incineration system blowers. Natural gas is used as fuel for drying and curing ovens.

Regulatory Alternative II (waterborne coatings) would result in an annual overall decrease in energy requirements of about 36,000 gigajoules in the fifth year. This net energy reduction results from the use of less coating per can because of higher solids content of the waterborne coatings upon which Regulatory Alternative II is based. The use of less coating reduces the amount of VOC and water that must be evaporated in the curing oven and therefore reduces energy requirements. The fifth-year impact would be a decrease in energy consumption equivalent to 34 million cubic feet of natural gas per year. Energy requirements for two-piece can coating operations would be reduced by 27,000 GJ by 1985, a 2 percent reduction from the baseline. Energy requirements for three-piece can sheet-coating operations (interior base coat, exterior base coat, and overvarnish coating) would be reduced by 4,500 GJ, a 5 percent reduction from the baseline. Energy requirements for the inside spray coating operation would be reduced by 1,000 GJ, a 2 percent reduction. Energy requirements for the coating of sheet stock for aluminum or steel ends would be reduced by 4,200 GJ by the fifth year, a 2 percent reduction. If solvent-borne coatings and incineration are used to attain the proposed standards, energy requirements for a two-piece can line would be increased by 160 percent over the base case and for a three-piece can

line by 140 percent. These percentages represent increases of energy requirements for the coating operations, not the entire can line.

The application of Regulatory Alternative III (waterborne coatings and no-varnish inks or UV-curable overvarnish coatings) would result in an annual decrease in energy requirements of about 920,000 gigajoules in the fifth year. The greatest part of the net energy reduction under this regulatory alternative results from the use of no-varnish inks or UV-curable overvarnish coatings. Two-piece can coating energy requirements would be reduced by 880,000 GJ, a 35 percent decrease from the baseline requirements. Energy requirements for three-piece can sheet-coating operations and forming operations (inside spray coating) would be reduced by 32,000 GJ and 1,000 GJ, respectively, a 36 and 2 percent decrease, respectively. Energy requirements for end coating operations would be reduced by 4,200 GJ in the fifth year, a 2 percent reduction, the same reduction as would be achieved by Alternative II. If solvent-borne coatings and incineration are used to attain the proposed standard, energy requirement for a two-piece can line would be increased by 73 percent over the base case and for a three-piece can line by 120 percent.

Economic impact

A discounted cash flow approach was used to analyze the economic impact of each regulatory alternative. Impacts are estimated for four types of beverage can production facilities: (1) three-piece sheet-coating operations, (2) three-piece can-forming (inside spray) operations, (3) steel and aluminum end coating operations, and (4) two-piece aluminum or steel can fabrication operations. Because the costs of applying end-sealing compound to steel or aluminum ends are essentially the same for solvent- and water-based materials, no economic impact analysis was considered necessary.

The regulatory alternatives assume current levels of capital requirements, annualized costs, and product prices (i.e., current return on investment [ROI]) would be maintained.

No economic impacts on the beverage can industry are expected to occur under Regulatory Alternative II or III. Among the control options considered for each production facility, there is at least one whose cost is equal to or less than the cost of complying with the baseline level of control. The use of low-solvent coatings upon which Regulatory Alternatives II and III are based does not require any capital expenditures over the base case and also requires less energy to evaporate VOC and water in the curing oven. If no standards were developed (Regulatory Alternative I), economic analysis shows that firms buiding new production facilities have an economic incentive to achieve a greater level of control than is currently required by the SIP's. However, if an owner or operator chooses to use solvent-borne coatings with add-on controls, an economic impact would result. This impact is discussed below.

The use of incineration would have an effect on product price or return on investment (ROI), and would require an additional capital outlay by three-piece can makers. Under Regulatory Alternative II, firms building new facilities involved in the production of three-piece cans (sheet coating operations, can forming operations, and end coating operations) would have to increase the output price by 1 percent, or absorb the additional costs and accept a cut in the rate of return from 1 to 10 percentage points. Under Regulatory Alternative III, output prices would increase about 1 percent If the additional costs were passed along to the customer. The ROI impacts would be roughly similar to those occurring under Regulatory Alternative II. Under both alternatives, adopting the incineration options would increase the capital requirements by approximately 10 percent for each of the three types of production facilities.

The use of incineration would also have an economic impact on two-piece canmakers. For either Regulatory Alternative II or III, if the additional costs were absorbed, ROI would decline from 2 to 6 percentage points, depending on plant size. Additional capital outlays would amount to between 2 and 5 percent of the capital required to meet the SIP level of control.

Some canmakers may elect to use solvent-borne coatings and incineration because of customer specifications or other reasons. In these cases, capital and operating costs would be higher than in the base case. While some negative economic impacts would result, they are considered acceptable and would not adversely affect the industry.

Selection of Best System of Continuous Emission Reduction

Although Regulatory Alternative III would result in greater reductions in VOC emissions and energy requirements than Regulatory Alternative II, implementation of Regulatory Alternative III would require the use of UV-curable coatings or no-varnish inks for overvarnish coating operations. However, UV-curable coatings and no-varnish inks cannot provide surface qualities and corrosion resistance necessary to meet all customer usages, and industry data indicate a trend away from the use of these coating. Furthermore, analysis of the industry indicates the infeasibility of segmenting the industry into discrete units that can or cannot use no-varnish inks or UV-curable overvarnishes. Because these coatings are not applicable to all segments of the industry, this alternative was not selected as the basis of the proposed standards.

Under Regulatory Alternative II, the use of waterborne coatings for all surface coating operations would reduce VOC emissions by about 4,800 Mg per year in the fifth year of applicability, a 32 percent reduction from the baseline represented by Regulatory Alternative I. No other adverse environmental impacts would result from implementation of this alternative. Energy requirements would be reduced by about 36,000 GJ/yr in the fifth year, a 2 percent reduction from the baseline. No adverse economic impact would result from application of Regulatory Alternative II unless the plant owner or operator chose to incinerate VOC emissions to achieve the proposed emission limits based on the use of waterborne coatings. Increased capital and operating costs associated with incineration are considered acceptable. Based on the assessment of environmental, energy, and economic impacts, Regulatory Alternative II was selected as the best system of continous emission reduction for the basis of the proposed standard.

Selection of Format for the Proposed Standards

A number of formats could be used to limit VOC emissions from beverage can surface coating operations. The format must be compatible with any of the compliance techniques that may be used in the industry and with any new techniques that might be developed in coming years. Standards for the control of VOC emissions could be expressed in terms of (1) the concentration of VOC in exhaust gases, (2) the mass of emissions per unit of production, (3) the mass of emissions per volume of coating applied, less water, (4) the mass of emissions per volume of coating solids applied, or (5) an overall percentage reduction.

One advantage of standards expressed in terms of the concentration of VOC in the exhaust gases would be that only a single sample would be needed to determine compliance. However, the concentration format would have several disadvantages. Emission testing would be necessary,

regardless of the compliance technique; emission tests would be required for every stack that exhausts gases to the atmosphere. Although the general provisions of 40 CFR 60 prohibit the addition of dilution air to exhaust gases, the presence of dilution air would be difficult to detect with certainty. Also, there are no currently available test methods to directly measure VOC concentrations in exhaust streams.

With a standard expressed in terms of mass of VOC per unit of production, compliance would be relatively simple to demonstrate when waterborne coatings are used, but would be more difficult with the use of a capture system and emission control device. For waterborne coatings a weighted averaged of the VOC content of each coating used would be determined and multiplied by the volume used over a given time period. This value would be divided by the production during that same time period to give the VOC emissions per unit of production. When emission control devices are used, the VOC emissions could be determined by stack test and the emissions could again be divided by the production to yield the VOC emissions per unit of production. However, a standard expressed in terms of production would require extensive recordkeeping provisions for production data. This format would not be very flexible in accommodating the range of coating thicknesses that are used by the industry to meet the requirements of the many types of beverage cans produced by the industry, especially in the case of merchant can plants. This format would penalize those coaters that, for reasons of product performance, must use an above-average coating thickness.

Standards expressed in terms of mass of VOC emissions per volume of coating, less water, have the advantage of being compatible with the format used in the CTG and are currently being adopted by most States. Furthermore, they have been accepted by both canmakers and coating suppliers.

Standards expressed in terms of the mass of VOC emissions per volume of coating solids overcome the problems associated with the first two formats. Stack testing would not be required unless add-on controls were used. Furthermore, it is applicable in those cases where a coater may choose to eliminate a coating step, substitute no-varnish inks, or use a radiation-curable coating.

A format requiring an overall percentage reduction is not compatible with compliance by the use of waterborne coatings because it would not directly give credit to those facilities which use coatings with low-solvent content.

For these reasons, the format selected for the proposed standard is expressed in terms of the mass of VOC per volume of coating solids.

Selection of Numerical Emission Limits

The numerical limits selected for the proposed standards are based on the use of waterborne coatings for all surface coating operations. Waterborne coatings are available and in use for all beverage can surface coating operations. In selecting numerical emission limits, the range of VOC contents of currently available coatings either in use or under qualification, the extent of such use, and the applicability to all beverage can surface coating requirements were considered. Numerical emission limits are not based on the lowest VOC-content coating identified but rather on the coating considered to the applicable for all requirements within each coating process. Emission limits and rationale for these selections are presented below.

Lower VOC-content waterborne coatings for the exterior base coat, other than clear base coats, for two-piece steel or aluminum cans range from 0.23 kilogram to 0.36 kilogram per litre of coating solids. One widely used coating has a VOC content of 0.29 kilogram per litre of solids. This coating is considered typical and therefore 0.29 kilograms VOC per litre of solids was selected as the proposed emission limitation for two-piece can exterior base coating operations. Clear base coats for two-piece beverage cans are similar to overvarnish and are therefore subject to the same emission limits as for the overvarnish coating operation.

Lower VOC-content overvarnishes for two-piece cans, three-piece steel sheets and clear base coats for two-piece steel and aluminum cans range from 0.26 to 0.50 kilogram VOC per litre of coating solids. Overvarnishes and clear base coatings must be compatible with a wide range of inks that are used to give beverage cans the distinctive appearance required for product recognition. In order to provide flexibility and compatibility with a wide range of inks, the proposed emission limitation for overvarnish and clear base coat operations was based on a commercially available coating with a VOC content of 0.46 kilograms per litre of solids.

Waterborne inside sprays currently in use or under qualification for two-piece beverage cans contain from 0.83 to 0.95 kilograms of VOC per litre of coating solids. One coating, which has a VOC content of 0.89 kilograms per litre of solids, accounts for 75 percent of the waterborne usage. Therefore this coating was used as the basis of the proposed emission limitation for two-piece inside spray—0.89 kilograms VOC per litre of coating solids.

For three-piece can inside spray, a lower VOC-content material can be used because a lance-type spray device applies the coating to the inside of the body shell before the bottom is attached. One three-piece can inside spray containing 0.64 kilogram VOC per litre of coating solids was identified as under qualification by a major beverage can manufacturer. Two lower VOC-content coatings, 0.58 and 0.61 kilograms per liter of coating solids were also identified as under consideration for qualification, but were not selected as the basis of the standards because of their status.

Materials with low solvent-borne content used for three-piece can sheet interior base coating commercially available or under qualification have a VOC content of 0.50 to 0.53 kilogram per litre of coating solids. The 0.50 coating is commercially available and is being used by at least one beverage can maker. Consequently, 0.50 kilograms VOC per litre of solids was selected as the proposed emission limitation for interior base coating of steel sheets for three-piece cans.

Two materials, both with 0.50 kilograms VOC per litre of coating solids, are commercially available for exterior base coating of steel sheets for three-piece cans. These coatings were selected as the basis for sheet exterior base coating. The proposed emission limitation was established at 0.50 kilograms VOC per litre of coating solids.

For both exterior and interior coating of steel or aluminum end sheets, coatings with VOC content of 0.48 to 0.52 kilograms per litre of coating solids were identified as being in use or under qualification. A coating with a VOC content of 0.50 was identified as being in commercial use for the exterior coating operation. Consequently, the proposed emission limitation for exterior coating of end stock was based on the coating in commercial use and set at 0.50 kilogram VOC per litre of coating solids. The average 0.50 kilogram per litre of coating solid of the coating being qualified for interior coating of end sheet stock was selected as the proposed emission limitation.

Although the majority of end-sealing compounds currently in use throughout the industry is solvent-based, many States have adapted regulations which require beverage can surface coating lines to meet the emission limitations

recommended in the CTG. New higher solids solvent-based compounds that meet the CTG emission limitations are being evaluated by the beverage can surface coating industry for both soft drinks and beer. Water-based end-sealing compounds with even lower emissions are at about the same stage of development. These compounds use water as the carrier, with the only VOC content in the form of pH adjusters or oils. The few problems experienced have been attributed to lack of experience in application of the water-based material and in storage and handling of the ends after application of the end-sealing compound.

The Administrator believes that these end-sealing compounds will be fully tested and applicable for use on beverage cans within two years because the new end-sealing compounds require a qualification period of 12 to 18 months. Consequently, to allow for the completion of these qualification studies, no standard will be proposed for the application of end-sealing compounds at this time. A standard will be proposed after the higher solids solvent-based or the water-based end-sealing compounds have been qualified for use in the beverage can industry. It is anticipated that this will occur by 1982. This action is consistent with the qualification testing schedules currently underway as part of the CTG programs.

Modification/Reconstruction Considerations

The history of steady growth by the beverage can industry has led many owners and operators to look for ways to increase production capacity. Increased production capacity is usually accomplished by increasing line speed, adding a new line, or building a new plant. Many manufacturers have found that the design speed of existing beverage can coating operations could be increased by replacing or modifying the drive motors, electrical controls, or both. All such changes that result in a capital expenditure, as defined in 40 CFR 60.14, would subject the existing facility to the provisions of the proposed standards, if the modification causes increased emissions. However, the control techniques on which the proposed standards are based can be applied to existing beverage can coating operations that undergo a modification. A conversion would require only minor changes in the coating equipment. The use of this control technique as a retrofit on existing coating operations is well documented in the literature.

Existing beverage can surface coating operations undergoing a reconstruction, as defined in 40 CFR 60.15, would also be subject to the proposed standards. As previously discussed, the conversion to waterborne coating could be accomplished with only minor changes in coating equipment.

Selection of Monitoring Requirements

Although there are no monitoring requirements for affected facilities that use waterborne coatings, monthly performance tests are required as specified in the following section. For affected facilities that use a capture system and control device, monitoring requirements are specified in addition to monthly performance testing.

Monitoring requirements are included in standards of performance to provide a means for ensuring proper operation and maintenance of emission control systems and to provide plant and enforcement personnel with sufficient data to determine compliance with the proposed standards. In the case of the beverage can surface coating industry, monitoring is required only when a capture system and incineration are used to comply with the standards. Two types of emission control systems can be used, incineration and carbon adsorption. Monitoring is required only for incineration systems.

The proposed standards would require the plant owner or operator to measure the incinerator operating temperature during each test of incinerator efficiency. Monitoring would then consist of recording the temperature parameters on a continuous basis. For those facilities using catalytic incineration, the plant owner or operator would be required to continuously monitor the gas temperature, both upstream and downstream of the catalyst bed, as a decline in the temperature difference between the inlet and exhaust or a decline in the temperature before the catalyst would be indicative of a reduction in a catalyst activity.

Selection of Performance Test Methods

The selection of a format for the proposed standards in terms of mass of VOC per volume of coating solids limits the choice of performance test methods to a mass balance of all coatings and diluent VOC-solvent used during the test period. Where a capture and emission control system are used, capture and destruction or removal efficiencies are required for the mass balance to determine VOC discharged to the atmosphere. Choice does exist, however, in the manner of obtaining the input data for the mass balance and the frequency of testing.

The performance test may be done on a one time basis upon startup or it can be done on a recurring basis. Requiring only an initial performance test on startup reduces the workload on the owner or operator but is not as effective for ensuring continual compliance as periodic performance testing. On the other hand, periodic performance testing imposes additional recordkeeping requiements. However, the data required for periodic performance testing are collected and maintained by the source as part of production and inventory records. Periodic performance testing provides a better enforcement tool and the additional effort is considered reasonable. Because most can makers maintain the coating data on a calendar month basis, requiring periodic performance testing on a monthly basis is considered reasonable.

The data required for a mass balance performance test include mass or volume and density of each coating and diluent solvent used, volume percent solids in each coating used, and weight percent VOC in each coating used. Mass or volume of each coating and diluent solvent used is obtainable from company records; density and weight percent VOC from analyis using Reference Method 24, or from data provided by the coating supplier. Volume percent solids must be obtained from coating suppliers.

The use of coating supplier data results in the minimum cost to the owner or operator because the data are generally available in the form of a coating specification sheet. However, the procedures used in determining the weight and volume percent composition can vary. Some suppliers base their coating specifications on a theoretical method, e.g., use of ASTM 2369 to determine weight fraction volatile matter and solids and theoretical weight fraction of water to determine weight fraction of VOC. Volume fraction of solids is determined by calculations using the theoretical density of either VOC or solids.

The use of Reference Method 24 to provide data required in determining the VOC content of a coating has the advantage of using the same procedures for all coating suppliers, thereby providing a common basis for comparison. However, volume fraction solids cannot be directly determined using Reference Method 24, coating supplier data being specified for this parameter.

Consequently, the use of data provided by the coating supplier is specified as the source of coating information required for the performance test. However, Reference Method 24 "Determination of Volatile Matter, Water Content, Density, Volume

Solids, and Weight Solids of Surface Coatings" would serve as the primary source of data from which the VOC content of the coatings would be determined for the purposes of enforcement.

Industry data indicate the major can manufacturers would probably achieve compliance with the proposed standards through the use of waterborne coatings. With few exceptions, beverage can coating facilities constructed during the past 5 years were designed for the use of waterborne coatings. In addition, all major manufacturers have converted or are in the process of converting to waterborne coatings. However, a small number of owners or operators may elect to achieve compliance with the proposed emission limits through the use of a capture ststem and emission control device to reduce VOC emissions from solvent-borne coatings. The use of an emission control system necessitates a test method to determine he destruction efficiency and the concentration of VOC in the exhaust gases in and out of the incinerator. Data obtained by Reference Method 25, "Determination of Total Gaseous Nonmethane Organic Emission as Carbon," would be used to calculate the destruction efficiency of incinerators. Reference Method 1 would be used for sample and velocity transverse, Reference Method 2 for velocity and volumetric flow rate, Reference Method 3 for gas analyses, and Reference Method 4 stack gas moisture.

Table 1.—*Distribution of VOC Emissions*

Coating operation	Emission distribution	
	Coater/ flashoff	Curing oven
2-piece aluminum or steel cans:		
Exterior base coat operation	0.75	0.25
Overvarnish coating operation	.75	.25
Inside spray coating operation	.80	.20
3-piece steel cans:		
Exterior base coat operation	.10	.90
Interior base coat operation	.10	.90
Overvarnish coating operation	.10	.90
Inside spray coating operation	.80	.20
Steel ends:		
Exterior coating operation	.10	.90
Interior coating operation	.10	.90

No standard method exists to determine the capture efficiency of an emission control system. The owner or operator would be required to use a procedure acceptable to the Administrator, which may include the use of the emission distributions between the coater and oven specified in the standards.

Limited information is available on the distribution of emissions between the cure oven and coater/flashoff. The owner or operator of an affected facility may use the emission distributions shown in Table 1 or may use other values acceptable to the Administrator. The values shown in Table 1 are based on information presented in the CTG, *Control of Volatile Organic Emissions from Existing Stationary Sources, Volume II: Surface Coating of Cans, Coils, Paper, Fabrics, Automobiles, and Light-Duty Trucks;* data from tests conducted by EPA and State agencies; and discussions with industry. Industry representatives agree that the values in Table 1 are representative of the industry. Comments on the emission distributions shown in Table 1 are invited. These values can be used to simplify the determination of control system capture efficiency.

Impacts of Reporting Requirements

A reports impact analysis for the beverage can surface coating industry was prepared in response to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) guidelines for implementing Executive Order 12044 (44 FR 30988, May 29, 1979). The purpose of the analysis is to estimate the economic impact of the reporting and recordkeeping requirements that would be imposed by the proposed standards and by those appearing in the General Provisions of 40 CFR Part 60. Included in the analysis are the rationale for the selection of the proposed requirements, an evaluation of the major alternatives considered prior to the selection of the proposed requirements, and a description of the information required by the General Provisions and by the proposed standards. A copy of the reports impact analysis is included in Subcategory II–I of the beverage can docket (EPA Docket No. OAQPS A–80–4).

Based on the reports impact analysis, a total of 12 industry person-years would be required to comply with the recordkeeping and reporting requirements through the first five years of applicability.

Public Hearing

A public hearing will be held to discuss the proposed standards in accordance with Section 307(d)(5) of the Clean Air Act. Persons wishing to make oral presentations should contact EPA at the address given in the Addresses section of this preamble. Oral presentations will be limited to 15 minutes each. Any member of the public may file a written statement before, during, or within 30 days after the hearing. Written statements should be addressed to the Central Docket Section address given in the Addresses section of this preamble.

A verbatim transcript of the hearing and written statements will be available for public inspection and copying during normal working hours at EPA's Central Docket Section in Washington, D.C. (see Addresses section of this preamble).

Docket

The docket is an organized and complete file of all the information submitted to or otherwise considered in the development of this proposed rulemaking. The principal purposes of the docket are (1) to allow interested parties to readily identify and locate documents so that they can intelligently and effectively participate in the rulemaking process, and (2) to serve as the record in case of judicial review.

Miscellaneous

As prescribed by Section 111, establishment of standards of performance for beverage can surface coating operations was preceded by the Administrator's determination (40 CFR 60.16, 44 FR 49222, dated August 21, 1979) that these sources contribute significantly to air pollution which may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare. In accordance with Section 117 of the Act, publication of this proposal was preceded by consultation with appropriate advisory committees, independent experts, and Federal departments and agencies. The Administrator will welcome comments on all aspects of the proposed regulation, including economic and technological issues, and test methods.

Comments are invited on the designation of individual coating operations as the affected facilities. Comments are also invited on the use or development of high-solids or water-based end-sealing compounds and on the emission distribution shown in Table 1. Any comments submitted to the Administrator on these issues, however, should contain specific information and data pertinent to an evaluation of the magnitude and severity of its impact and suggested alternative courses of action that would reduce or eliminate this impact.

It should be noted that standards of performance for new sources established under Section 111 of the Clean Air Act reflect

> • • • application of the best technological system of continuous emission reduction which (taking into consideration the cost of achieving such emission reduction, any nonair quality health and environmental impact and energy requirements) the Administrator determines has been adequately demonstrated [Section 111 (a)(1)].

Although there may be emission control technology available that can

reduce emissions below those levels required to comply with standard of performance, this technology might not be selected as the basis of standards of performance due to costs associated with its use. Accordingly, standards of performance should not be viewed as the ultimate in achievable emission control. In fact, the Act required (or has the potential for requiring) the imposition of a more stringent emission standard in several situations.

For example, applicable costs do not necessarily play as prominent a role in determining the "lowest achievable emission rate" for new or modified sources locating in nonattainment areas, i.e., those areas where statutorily-mandated health and welfare standards are being violated. In this respect, Section 173 of the Act requires that new or modified sources constructed in an area where ambient pollutant concentrations exceed the National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) must reduce emissions to the level that reflects the "lowest achievable emission rate" (LAER), as defined in Section 171(3) for such category of source. The statute defines LAER as that rate of emissions based on the following, whichever is more stringent:

(A) The most stringent emission limitation which is contained in the implementation plan of any state for such class or category of source, unless the owner or operator of the proposed source demonstrates that such limitations are not achievable, or

(B) The most stringent emission limitation which is achieved in practice by such class or category of source.

In no event can the emission rate exceed any applicable new source performance standard [Section 171(3)].

A similar situation may arise under the prevention of significant deterioration of air quality provisions of the Act (Part C). These provisions require that certain sources [referred to in Section 169(1)] employ "best available control technology" (BACT) as defined in Section 169(3) for all pollutants regulated under the Act. Best available control technology must be determined on a case-by-case basis, taking energy, environmental and economic impacts and other costs into account. In no event may the application of BACT result in emissions of any pollutants which will exceed the emissions allowed by an applicable standard established pursuant to Section 111 (or 112) of the Act.

In all events, State Implementation Plans (SIP's) approved or promulgated under Section 110 of the Act must provide for the attainment and maintenance of NAAQS designed to protect public health and welfare. For this purpose, SIP's must in some cases require greater emission reduction than those required by standards of performance for new sources.

Finally States are free under Section 116 of the Act to establish even more stringent emission limits than those established under Section 111 or those necessary to attain or maintain the NAAQS under Section 110. Accordingly, new sources may in some cases be subject to limitations more stringent than standards of performance under Section 111, and prospective owners and operators of new sources should be aware of this possibility in planning for such facilities.

This regulation will be reviewed four years from the date of promulgation as required by the Clean Air Act. This review will include an assessment of such factors as the need for integration with other programs, the existence of alternative methods, enforceability, improvements in emission control technology, and reporting requirements. The reporting requirements in this regulation will be reviewed as required under EPA's sunset policy for reporting requirements in regulations.

Section 317 of the Clean Air Act requires the Administrator to prepare an economic impact assessment for any new source standard of performance promulgated under Section 111(b) of the Act. An economic impact assessment was prepared for the proposed regulations and for other regulatory alternatives. All aspects of the assessment were considered in the formulation of the proposed standards to insure that the proposed standards would represent the best system of emission reduction considering costs. The economic impact assessment is included in the Background Information Document.

Dated: November 19, 1980.

Douglas M. Costle,

Administrator.

PART 60—STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE FOR NEW STATIONARY SOURCES

It is proposed that 40 CFR Part 60 be amended by adding a new Subpart WW as follows:

Subpart WW—Standards of Performance for the Beverage Can Surface Coating Industry

Sec.

60.490 Applicability and designation of affected facility.
60.491 Definitions.
60.492 Standards for volatile organic compounds.
60.493 Performance test and compliance provisions.
60.494 Monitoring of emissions and operations.
60.495 Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.
60.496 Test methods and procedures.

Authority.—Sections 111 and 301(a) of the Clean Air Act, as amended [42 U.S.C. 7411 and 7601(a)], and additional authority, as noted below.

Subpart WW—Standards of Performance for the Beverage Can Surface Coating Industry

§ 60.490 Applicability and designation of affected facility.

(a) The provisions of this subpart apply to the following affected facilities in beverage can surface coating, beverage can sheet coating, and beverage can end coating lines: each interior base coat operation, over-varnish coating operation, inside spray coating operation, aluminum- or steel-end interior coating operation, and aluminum- or steel-end exterior coating operation.

(b) The provisions of this subpart apply to any affected facility which is identified in paragraph (a) of this section and commences construction, modification, or reconstruction after November 26, 1980.

§ 60.491 Definitions.

(a) All terms which are used in this subpart and are not defined below are given the same meaning as in the Act and in Subpart A of this part.

"Aluminum end" means the aluminum top end for three- and two-piece beverage cans.

"Beverage can" means any two-piece steel or aluminum container or three-piece steel container in which soft drinks or beer, including malt liquor, are packaged. The definition does not include containers in which fruit or vegetable juices are packaged.

"End interior coating operation" means the system on each beverage can surface coating or sheet coating line used to apply a coating, which isolates the contents of the beverage can, to the steel or aluminum sheets from which ends for two-piece and three-piece beverage can are manufactured. The end interior coating operation consists of the coating application station, flashoff area, and curing oven.

"End exterior coating operation" means the system on each beverage can surface coating or sheet coating line used to apply a protective coating to the aluminum or steel sheets from which the ends for two-piece and three-piece beverage cans are manufactured. The end exterior coating operation consists

of the coating application station, flashoff area, and curing oven.

"Exterior base operation" means the system on each beverage can surface coating or sheet coating line used to apply a coating to the exterior of a two-piece beverage can body or to the steel sheets from which three-piece beverage can bodies are made. The exterior base coat provides corrosion resistance and a background for lithography or printing operations. The exterior base coat operation consists of the coating application station, flashoff area, and curing oven. The exterior base coat may be pigmented or clear (unpigmented).

"Interior base coat operation" means the system on each beverage can surface coating or sheet coating line used to apply a coating to the steel sheets from which three-piece beverage can bodies are formed. The interior base coat is the first layer of the protective coating which isolates the contents of a three-piece beverage can from the metal can body. The interior basecoat operation consists of the coating application station, flashoff area, and curing oven.

"Inside spray coating operation" means the system on each beverage can surface coating line used to apply a coating to the interior of a two- or three-piece beverage can body. This coating provides a protective film between the contents of the beverage can and the metal can body. The inside spray coating operation consists of the coating application station, flashoff area, and curing oven. Multiple applications of an inside spray coating are considered to be a single coating operation.

"Overvarnish coating operation" means the system on each beverage can surface coating or sheet coating line used to apply a coating over ink that reduces friction for automated beverage can filling equipment, provides gloss, and protects the finished beverage can body from abrasion and corrosion. The overvarnish coating is applied to the steel sheets from which three-piece beverage can bodies are made and to two-piece beverage can bodies. The coating operation consists of the coating application station, flashoff area, and curing oven.

"Steel end" means the beverage can ends which are formed from surface coated steel sheets for three-piece cans.

"Three-piece can" means any beverage can which consists of a surface coated steel body, a bottom, and a top. The three-piece can is manufactured from a surface coated rectangular sheet that is rolled into a tubular body and soldered, welded, or cement sealed at the seam to form a beverage can body. One end is attached to the can body by roll seaming during the manufacturing process, and the other end is attached during the filling process.

"Two-piece can" means any beverage can that consists of a body manufactured from a single piece of steel or aluminum and a top. Coatings for a two-piece can are usually applied after fabrication of the can body.

"VOC content" means all volatile organic compounds (VOC) that are in a coating. VOC are expressed in terms of kilograms of VOC per litre of coating solids.

(b) Notations used under § 60.493 of this subpart are defined below:

C_a = concentration in gas stream in vents after control device (parts per million as carbon)

C_b = concentration in gas stream in vents before control device (parts per million as carbon)

D_c = coatings density (kilograms per litre)

D_d = diluent VOC-solvents density (kilograms per litre)

D_r = density of VOC solvent recovered by an emission control device (kilograms per litre)

E = emission control device efficiency, inlet versus outlet (fraction)

F = capture efficiency, captured and routed to one control device versus total emissions (fraction)

G = volume-weighted average of VOC content of coatings consumed in a calendar month (kilograms per litre of coating solids)

H_a = fraction of VOC emitted at the coater and flashoff areas captured by a collection system

H_b = fraction of VOC emitted at the cure oven captured by a collection system

L_c = volume of coating, as received (litres)

L_d = volume of diluent VOC-solvent added to coating (litres)

L_r = volume of VOC-solvent recovered by an emission control device (litre)

L_s = volume of coating solids (litres)

M_d = mass of diluent VOC-solvent (kilograms)

M_o = mass of VOC-solvent in coating, as received (kilograms)

M_r = mass of VOC-solvent recovered by emission control device (kilograms)

N = volume-weighted average of VOC emission to atmosphere in a calendar month (kilograms per litre of coating solids)

Q_a = volumetric flow rate in vents after control device (dry standard cubic meters per hour)

Q_b = volumetric flow rate in vents before control device (dry standard cubic meters per hour)

R = overall reduction efficiency from all control systems for an affected facility (fraction)

S_a = fraction of VOC in coating and diluent VOC-solvent emitted at the coater and flashoff area for a coating operation

S_b = fraction of VOC in coating and diluent solvent emitted at the cure oven for a coating operation

V_s = volume fraction of solids in coatings, as received

W_o = weight fraction of VOC-solvent in coatings, as received.

§ 60.492 Standards for volatile organic compounds.

On or after the date on which the initial performance test required by § 60.8(a) is completed, no owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart shall discharge or cause the discharge of VOC emissions to the atmosphere that exceed the following volume-weighted calendar-month average emissions:

(a) 0.29 kilogram of VOC per litre of coating solids from each two-piece can exterior base coat operation, except clear base coat;

(b) 0.46 kilogram of VOC per litre of coating solids from each two-piece can clear base coat operation and from each overvarnish coating operation;

(c) 0.50 kilogram of VOC per litre of coating solids from each three-piece can sheet base coating operation and each aluminum- or steel-end sheet coating operation;

(d) 0.89 kilogram of VOC per litre of coating solids from each two-piece can inside spray coating operation; and

(e) 0.64 kilogram of VOC per litre of coating solids from each three-piece can inside spray coating operationn.

§ 60.493 Performance test and compliance provisions.

(a) Sections 60.8 (d) and (f) do not apply to the performance test procedures required by this subpart.

(b) The owner or operator of an affected facility shall conduct an initial performance test as required under Section 60.8(a) and thereafter a performance test each calendar month for each affected facility according to the procedures in this section.

(c) The owner or operator shall use the following procedures for determining monthly volume-weighted average emissions of VOC in kilograms per litre of coating solids.

(1) An owner or operator shall use the following procedures for any affected facility which does not use a capture system and a control device to comply with the emission limit specified under § 60.492.

(i) Calculate the volume-weighted average of the total mass of VOC per volume of coating solids used during each calendar month for each affected facility, except as provided under § 60.493(c)(1)(D). Each monthly calculation is considered a performance test. The owner or operator shall determine the composition of the coatings by formulation data supplied by the manufacturer of the coating or by an analysis of each coating, as received,

using Reference Method 24. The Administrator may require the owner or operator who uses formulation data supplied by the manufacturer of the coating to determine the VOC content of coatings using Reference Method 24 or an equivalent or alternative method. The owner or operator shall determine the volume of coating and the mass of VOC-solvent used for thinning purposes from company records on a monthly basis. If a common coating distribution system serves more than one affected facility or serves both affected and existing facilities, the owner or operator shall estimate the volume of coating used at each facility by using the average dry weight of coating, number of cans, and size of cans being processed by each affected and existing facility or by other procedures acceptable to the Administrator. The weighted average of the total mass of VOC per volume of coating solids used each calendar month will be determined by the following procedures.

(A) Calculate the mass of VOC used ($M_o + M_d$) during each calendar month for each affected facility by the following equation:

$$M_o + M_d = \sum_{i=1}^{n} L_{ci} D_{ci} W_{oi} + \sum_{j=1}^{m} L_{dj} D_{dj}$$

[$\Sigma L_{dj} D_{dj}$ will be 0 if no VOC solvent is added to the coatings, as received.]

Where: n is the number of different coatings used during the calendar month and m is the number of different diluent VOC-solvents used during the calendar month.

(B) Calculate the total volume of coating solids used (L_s) in each calendar month for each affected facility by the following equation:

$$L_s = \sum_{i=1}^{n} L_{ci} V_{si}$$

where: n is the number of different coatings used during the calendar month.

(C) Calculate the volume-weighted average mass of VOC per volume of solids used (G) during the calendar month for each affected facility by the following equation:

$$G = \frac{M_o + M_d}{L_s}$$

(ii) Calculate the volume-weighted average of VOC emissions discharged to the atmosphere (N) during the calendar month for each affected facility by the following equation:

$N = G$

(iii) Where the value of the volume-weighted average of mass of VOC per volume of solids discharged to the atmosphere (N) is less than or equal to the applicable emission limit specified under § 60.492, the affected facility is in compliance.

(iv) For each affected facility that uses only coatings, as received, which individually have a VOC content equal to or less than the limit specified under § 60.492 and does not add VOC to the coating during the distribution or application process, the owner or operator may demonstrate compliance by determining the formulation of the coatings from data determined using Reference Method 24 or data provided by the manufacturer of the coating. If required by the Administrator, the owner or operator shall determine the composition of any coating, as applied, by using Reference Method 24 or an equivalent or alternative method. Where the value of the VOC content of each coating used is equal to or less than the applicable emission limit specified under § 60.492, the affected facility is in compliance.

(2) An owner or operator shall use the following procedures for any affected facility that uses a capture system and a control device that destroys VOC (e.g., incinerator) to comply with the emission limit specified under § 60.492.

(i) Calculate the volume-weighted average of the total mass of VOC per volumn of coating solids (G) used during each calendar month for each affected facility as described under § 60.493(c)(1)(i).

(ii) Calculate the volume-weighted average of VOC emissions discharged to the atmosphere (N) during each calendar month by the following equation:

$N = G \times [1 - R]$

For the initial performance test the overall reduction efficiency (R) shall be determined as prescribed in A, B, and C below. In subsequent months, the owner or operator may use the most recently determined overall reduction efficiency (R) for the performance test providing control device, and capture system operating conditions have not changed. The procedure in A, B, and C, below, shall be repeated when directed by the Administrator or when the owner or operator elects to operate the control device or capture system at conditions different from the initial performance test.

(A) Determine the fraction (F) of total VOC emitted by an affected facility that enters the control device using the following equation:

$F = S_e H_e + S_h H_h$

where H_e and H_h shall be determined by a method that has been previously approved by the Administrator. The owner or operator may use the values of S_e and S_h specified in Table 1 or other values determined by a method that has been previously approved by the Administrator.

(B) Determine the destruction efficiency of the control device (E) using values of the volumetric flow rate of each of the gas streams and the VOC content (as carbon) of each of the gas streams in and out of the device by the following equation.

$$E = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} Q_{bi} C_{bi} - \sum_{j=1}^{m} Q_{aj} C_{aj}}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} Q_{bi} C_{bi}}$$

Where: n is the number vents before the control device, and m is the number of vents after the control device.

(C) Determine overall reduction efficiency (R) using the following equation:

$R = EF$

(iii) If the volume-weighted average of mass of VOC emitted to the atmosphere for each calendar month (N) is less than or equal to the applicable emission limit

specified under § 60.492, the affected facility is in compliance. Each monthly calculation is a performance test.

Table I.—*Distribution of VOC Emissions*

Coating operation	Emission distribution	
	Coater/ flashoff (S_c)	Curing oven (S_o)
2-piece aluminum or steel cans:		
Exterior base coat operation	0.75	0.25
Overvarnish coating operation	.75	.25
Inside spray coating operation	.80	.20
3-piece steel cans:		
Exterior base coat operation	.10	.90
Interior base coat operation	.10	.90
Overvarnish coating operation	.10	.90
Inside spray coating operation	.80	.20
Steel ends:		
Exterior coating operation	.10	.90
Interior coating operation	.10	.90

(3) An owner or operator shall use the following procedure for any affected facility which uses a capture system and a control device that recovers the VOC (e.g., carbon adsorber) to comply with the applicable emission limit specified under § 60.492.

(i) Calculate the volume-weighted average of the total mass of VOC per volume of coating solids (G) used during each calendar month for each affected facility as described under § 60.493(c)(1)(i).

(ii) Calculate the total mass of VOC recovered (M_r) during each calendar month using the following equation:

$$M_r = L_r D_r$$

(iii) Calculate overall reduction efficiency of the control device (R) for each calendar month for each affected facility using the following equation:

$$R = \frac{M_r}{M_o + M_d}$$

(iv) Calculate the volume-weighted average mass of VOC emitted to the atmosphere (N) for each calendar month for each affected facility using the following equation:

$$N = G(1 - R)$$

(v) If the weighted average of VOC emitted to the atmosphere for each calendar month (N) is less than or equal to the applicable emission limit specified under § 60.492, the affected facility is in compliance. Each monthly calculation is a performance test.

§ 60.494 Monitoring of emission and operations.

The owner or operator of an affected facility that uses a capture system and an incinerator to comply with the emission limits specified under § 60.492 shall install, calibrate, maintain, and operate temperature measurement devices as prescribed below:

(a) Where thermal incineration is used, a temperature measurement device shall be installed in the firebox. Where catalytic incineration is used, a temperature measurement device shall be installed in the gas stream immediately before and after the catalyst bed.

(b) Each temperature measurement device shall be installed, calibrated, and maintained according to the manufacturer's specifications. The device shall have an accuracy the greater of ±0.75 percent of the temperature being measured expressed in °C or ±2.5° C.

(c) Each temperature measurement device shall be equipped with a recording device so that a permanent continuous record is produced.

(Sec. 114 of the Clean Air Act as amended (42 U.S.C. 7414))

§ 60.495 Reporting and recordkeeping requirements.

(a) Each owner or operator of an affected facility shall include the following data in the initial compliance report required under § 60.8(a):

(1) Where only coatings which individually have a VOC content equal to or less than the limits specified under § 60.492 are used, and no VOC is added to the coating during the application or distribution process, the owner or operator shall provide a list of the coatings used for each affected facility and the VOC content of each coating calculated from formulation data determined using Reference Method 24 or supplied by the manufacturers of the coatings.

(2) Where one or more coatings which individually have a VOC content greater than the limits specified under § 60.492 are used or where VOC are added or used in the coating process, the owner or operator shall report for each affected facility the volume-weighted average of the total mass of VOC per volume of coating solids.

(3) Where compliance is achieved through the use of incineration, the owner or operator shall include in the initial performance test required under § 60.8(a) or subsequent performance tests at which destruction efficiency is determined the combustion temperature (or the gas temperature upstream and downstream of the catalyst bed), the total mass of VOC per volume of coating solids before and after the incinerator, capture efficiency, and the destruction efficiency of the incinerator used to attain compliance with the applicable emission limit specified under § 60.492. The owner or operator shall also include a description of the method used to establish the amount of VOC captured by the capture system and sent to the control device.

(b) Following the initial compliance report, each owner or operator of an affected facility shall report, within ten calendar days, each instance in which the volume-weighted average of the total mass of VOC per volume of coating solids, after the control device if a capture device and control system are used, is greater than the limit specified under § 60.492.

(c) Where compliance with § 60.492 is achieved through the use of incineration, the owner or operator shall continuously record the incinerator combustion temperature during coating operations for theremal incineration or the gas temperature upstream and downstream of the incinerator catalyst bed during coating operations for catalytic incineration. For thermal incinerators the owner or operator shall report quarterly all 3-hour periods during which the average temperature (when cans are being processed) of the device was more than 28° C below the average temperature of the device during the most recent performance test at which destruction efficiency was determined as specified under § 60.493. For catalytic incinerators, the owner or operator shall report quarterly all 3-hour periods during which the average temperature of the device immediately before the catalyst bed, when cans are being processed, is more than 28° C below the average temperature of the device during the most recent performance test at which destruction efficiency was determined as specified under § 60.493, and all 3-hour periods during which the average temperature difference across the catalyst bed, when cans are being processed, is less than 80 percent of the average temperature difference of the device during the most recent performance test at which destruction efficiency was determined as specified under § 60.493. Negative reports are required. The owner or operator shall submit negative reports, quarterly, if there were no periods of reportable temperature differences.

(d) Each owner or operator subject to the provisions of this subpart shall

maintain at the source, for a period of at least 2 years, records of all data and calculations used to determine VOC emissions from each affected facility. Where compliance is achieved through the use of thermal incineration, each owner or operator shall maintain, at the source, daily records of the incinerator combustion chamber temperature. If catalytic incineration is used, the owner or operator shall maintain at the source daily records of the gas temperature, both upstream and downstream of the incinerator catalyst bed. Where compliance is achieved through the use of a solvent recovery system, the owner or operator shall maintain at the source daily records of the amount of solvent recovered by the system for each affected facility.

(Sec. 114 of the Clean Air Act as amended (42 U.S.C. 7414))

§ 60.496 Reference methods and procedures.

(a) The reference methods in Appendix A to this part, except as provided in § 60.8, shall be used to conduct performance tests.

(1) Reference Method 24 or an equivalent or alternative method approved by the Administrator for the determination of formulation data from which the VOC content of the coatings used for each affected facility can be calculated. In the event of dispute, Reference Method 24 shall be the reference method.

(2) Reference Method 25 or an equivalent or alternative method for the determination of the VOC concentration in the effluent gas entering and leaving the incinerator for each stack equipped with an emission control device. The owner or operator shall notify the Administrator 30 days in advance of any State test using Reference Method 25. The following reference methods are to be used in conjunction with Reference Method 25:

(i) Method 1 for sample and velocity traverses,

(ii) Method 2 for velocity and volumetric flow rate,

(iii) Method 3 for gas analysis, and

(iv) Method for stack gas moisture.

(b) For Reference Method 24, the coating sample must be a 1-litre sample collected in a 1-litre container at a point where the sample will be representative of the coating material.

(c) For Reference Method 25, the sampling time for each of three runs must be at least 1 hour. The minimum sample volume must be 0.003 dscm except that shorter sampling times or smaller volumes, when necessitated by process variables or other factors, may be approved by the Administrator. The Administrator will approve the sampling of representative stacks on a case-by-case basis if the owner or operator can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Administrator that the testing of representative stacks would yield results comparable to those that would be obtained by testing all stacks.

(Sec. 114 of the Clean Air Act as amended (42 U.S.C. 7414))

[FR Doc. 80-36885 Filed 11-25-80; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-26-M

Reader Aids

Federal Register

Vol. 45, No. 230

Wednesday, November 26, 1980

INFORMATION AND ASSISTANCE

PUBLICATIONS

Code of Federal Regulations

CFR Unit	202-523-3419 523-3517
General information, index, and finding aids	523-5227
Incorporation by reference	523-4534
Printing schedules and pricing information	523-3419

Federal Register

Corrections	523-5237
Daily Issue Unit	523-5237
General information, index, and finding aids	523-5227
Public Inspection Desk	633-6930
Scheduling of documents	523-3187

Laws

Indexes	523-5232
Law numbers and dates	523-5282 523-5266
Slip law orders (GPO)	275-3030

Presidential Documents

Executive orders and proclamations	523-5233
Public Papers of the President	523-5235
Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents	523-5235

Privacy Act Compilation 523-3517

United States Government Manual 523-5230

SERVICES

Agency services	523-3408
Automation	523-3408
Dial-a-Reg	
Chicago, Ill.	312-663-0884
Los Angeles, Calif.	213-688-6694
Washington, D.C.	202-523-5022
Magnetic tapes of FR issues and CFR volumes (GPO)	275-2867
Public briefings: "The Federal Register—What It Is and How To Use It"	523-5235
Public Inspection Desk	633-6930
Regulations Writing Seminar	523-5240
Special Projects	523-4534
Subscription orders and problems (GPO)	783-3238
TTY for the deaf	523-5239

FEDERAL REGISTER PAGES AND DATES, NOVEMBER

72617-72994.....3
72995-73464.....4
73465-73628.....5
73629-73894.....6
73895-74462.....7
74463-74692.....10
74693-74894.....12
74895-75158.....13
75159-75632.....14
75633-76084.....17
76085-76428.....18
76429-76640.....19
76641-76936.....20
76937-77410.....21
77411-78116.....24
78117-78614.....25
78615-78994.....26

CFR PARTS AFFECTED DURING NOVEMBER

At the end of each month, the Office of the Federal Register publishes separately a list of CFR Sections Affected (LSA), which lists parts and sections affected by documents published since the revision date of each title.

3 CFR

Administrative Orders:
Notice of November 12, 1980.....75159

Executive Orders:
11764 (Revoked by EO 12250).....72995
11914 (Revoked by EO 12250).....72995
12170 (See Notice of November 12, 1980).....75159
12246 (Revoked by EO 12251).....76085
12250.....72995
12251.....76085
12252.....78615

Proclamations:
4801.....72617
4802.....75161
4803.....75633
4804.....75635
4805.....78617

5 CFR

550.....72999
591.....76087
737.....75500
831.....76087
890.....76087
900.....75508

Proposed Rules:
831.....75217
930.....76183

6 CFR

705.....72619, 76641
706.....76641

7 CFR

210.....76937
220.....76937
246.....74854
272.....72999, 77258
273.....72999
276.....77258
371.....73465
404.....74463
408.....78117
418.....74895, 78117
419.....74898, 78117
430.....74899, 78117
438.....78118
439.....73629, 78118
713.....76938
718.....76939
726.....73895
730.....76941
904.....76942
905.....74463, 76650
906.....73895
907.....75163, 76651
910.....73897, 75164, 76942
911.....76429
915.....76429
927.....74464
930.....78619
931.....74464
944.....73895
959.....76943
966.....78619
971.....73897
982.....73634, 76430
989.....75164
999.....73634, 76430
1124.....73635
1250.....75165
1280.....76638
1421.....73636, 75637, 76430
1430.....73009
1493.....78622
1701.....74465, 76943
1823.....73636
1901.....73636
1942.....73636
1980.....73646, 76089
2851.....76944
2853.....76965

Proposed Rules:
Ch. I-VII.....75454
Ch. IX-XII.....75454
Ch. XIV-XVIII.....75454
Ch. XXI.....75454
Ch. XXIV-XXIX.....75454
Ch. XXVIII.....77037
28.....75218
46.....74491
225.....74384
271.....74725
278.....74725
282.....75218
724.....75219
726.....77035
971.....73498
984.....77448
989.....75220
993.....77448
1001.....75956
1002.....75956
1004.....75956
1006.....75956
1007.....75956
1011.....75956
1012.....75956
1013.....75956
1030.....75956
1032.....75956
1033.....75956
1036.....75956
1040.....75956
1044.....75956
1046.....75956
1049.....75956
1050.....75956

1062.....75956
1064.....75956
1065.....75956
1068.....75956
1071.....75956
1073.....75956
1075.....75956
1076.....75956
1079.....75956
1093.....75956
1094.....75956
1096.....75956
1097.....75956
1098.....75956
1099.....75956
1102.....75956
1104.....75956
1106.....75956
1108.....75956
1120.....75956
1124.....75956
1125.....75956
1126.....75956
1131.....75956
1132.....75956
1133.....74726, 75956
1134.....75956
1135.....75956
1136.....75956
1137.....75956
1138.....75956
1139.....75956
1701.....78157
1902.....76440
1942.....77036
2852.....77038

8 CFR

103.....72625
204.....75166, 76652
238.....74465, 76430

9 CFR

82.....72626, 73648, 75168, 76965, 78622, 78623
320.....76965

Proposed Rules:

Ch. I–IV.....75454
92.....76689
95.....78699
113.....73079
318.....73947
381.....73947

10 CFR

Ch. II.....74422
2.....73465, 74693
11.....76968
50.....76602, 76968
51.....74693
70.....73012, 74693, 76968
72.....74693, 78623
73.....74693
75.....73012
150.....74693
205.....76038
210.....74672
211.....74672, 78588
212.....72616, 74432, 78588
221.....76431
456.....74712
781.....73446

Proposed Rules:

Ch. I.....76446, 78700
Ch. II.....72886
Ch. III.....72886
Ch. X.....72886
31.....78700
50.....73080, 75536, 77450
51.....74492
170.....74493
211.....76214
212.....74494
457.....78700
474.....73684, 78701
500.....73499
503.....73499
504.....73499
505.....73499
506.....73499
1530.....73081
745.....78600

12 CFR

201.....78624
204.....73013
211.....76094
217.....72630, 73016
336.....77411
525.....76095
526.....72631, 76103
541.....76095, 76104
545.....76095, 76103, 76104
561.....76104, 76111
563.....73466, 76095, 76103, 76104, 76111, 76652
569a.....76652
612.....73648
701.....75169
741.....78624
742.....73016
761.....75169

Proposed Rules:

Ch. VI.....72675
11.....75669
225.....75221
545.....72675
546.....72681
561.....72681
563c.....72681
571.....72681
701.....75224

13 CFR

107.....73017
108.....73020
305.....74900
309.....74900, 74902
315.....74902

Proposed Rules:

Ch. III.....75225, 78918
Ch. V.....75225, 78918

14 CFR

39.....74466–74468, 75637, 75638, 76653, 77413–77416
71.....74468, 76654, 76658, 77417–77418
93.....72637, 73652
97.....72643, 76658
204.....73020
323.....73020
384.....76973
385.....76973
1214.....73022

Proposed Rules:

Ch. I.....73688, 76691
21.....76868
23.....76872
25.....76872
27.....76872
29.....76872
33.....76872
39.....74495, 76691, 77450
43.....76894
71.....74497, 74932, 75684, 76692, 76694, 77451, 77452
73.....76694
91.....75098, 76894
121.....75138
204.....73085
291.....73085
298.....73086, 73087
300.....73092
1214.....74499

15 CFR

385.....76435
399.....76435
931.....78118
970.....76661

Proposed Rules:

Ch. I–III.....75225
Ch. I.....78918
Ch. II.....78918
Ch. III.....78918
Ch. IV.....78918
Ch. VIII.....75225
Ch. IX.....78918
Ch. XII.....75225, 78918
1001.....77038

16 CFR

1.....78626
13.....74469, 74712–74714, 74903, 75179, 75181, 77419
1615.....73884
1616.....73884
1700.....78630

Proposed Rules:

13.....74502
456.....72683
1031.....76447
1032.....76447
1145.....75685
1406.....76018

17 CFR

200.....74905, 76974
210.....76974
229.....76974, 76982
231.....72644
239.....73898, 75182, 76974
240.....73906, 76974, 76982
249.....73906, 76974
270.....73898, 73915
274.....73898

Proposed Rules:

Ch. I.....77043
5.....73499–73504
229.....78157
230.....72685
231.....76695
239.....78157, 78158
240.....74505
241.....76695
249.....74505, 78158
250.....73509
251.....76695
274.....78158

18 CFR

4.....76115, 77420
141.....74715
260.....75192
270.....73027
271.....73027, 76664, 76671, 76675, 76676, 77421
273.....77421
274.....77421
282.....73033, 76681
375.....76115
711.....73033
713.....73033
714.....73034
716.....73033
725.....76682

Proposed Rules:

125.....76696
225.....76696
260.....77043
271.....72687, 76700, 78701–78703
282.....74505
292.....74934
726.....76701

19 CFR

6.....72646
10.....75639
19.....75639
113.....75639
144.....75639
153.....75639
159.....75639
174.....75639
175.....75639
177.....75639
355.....74469, 78118

Proposed Rules:

Ch. III.....78918
148.....78704
151.....76449

20 CFR

401.....74906
404.....78633
416.....72647

Proposed Rules:

208.....78704
210.....78704
216.....78704
217.....78704
219.....78704
221.....78704
230.....78704
232.....78704
237.....78704
238.....78704
341.....74510
404.....75225, 78726
416.....75225, 75226, 78726

21 CFR

173.....73922
175.....76997, 76998
178.....76999
193.....75643
203.....78514
430.....75194
431.....75194
436.....75194
444.....73034
450.....75194
520.....75199, 78118
558.....76999
601.....73922
1312.....74715

Proposed Rules:

16.....74158

20.....74158, 76183
70.....77043
81.....75226
161.....73092-73095
193.....73955
310.....73955
436.....78162
610.....75229
700.....73960
710.....73960
720.....73960
730.....73960
803.....76183
890.....75230
899.....74158
1040.....74374

22 CFR

Proposed Rules:
11.....73100
51.....78163
181.....75643

23 CFR

635.....75643

Proposed Rules:
480.....76705
625.....74940, 75690
635.....77455
645.....76924
652.....74940
663.....74940

24 CFR

Ch. II.....77368
201.....73923
203.....76376
220.....76376
221.....76376
226.....76376
227.....76376
234.....76376
240.....76376
570.....73610
888.....76052
889.....74919
3610.....75610

Proposed Rules:
51.....76710
144.....78508
146.....73454
200.....72688, 73512, 76450
203.....72690
204.....78164
207.....76710
213.....76710
220.....72690
221.....72690, 76710
222.....72690
226.....72690
227.....72690
232.....76710
234.....72690
240.....72690
241.....76710
242.....76710, 78166
570.....72691, 73512, 73962, 74940
808.....73264
882.....72697
888.....73264

25 CFR

31g.....75199
258.....74688

Proposed Rules:
103a.....72699
103b.....72699
700.....76710

26 CFR

1.....72649, 74716, 74721, 75200, 75644, 75647, 76128, 78633
3.....72649
4.....75647
5b.....76128
11.....75200
23.....73467
31.....72651
48.....72653
53.....72649
150.....73467, 75206, 78119
301.....72651

Proposed Rules:
1.....75692-75695, 76450, 78167
4.....75695
51.....73512, 75231
53.....78167
301.....75709

27 CFR

6.....74919

Proposed Rules:
4.....72702, 74942
6.....73692
9.....73694
181.....76191

28 CFR

0.....76684
50.....76436
523.....75124
540.....75125
544.....75124, 75126
548.....75126
551.....75127
552.....75127
570.....75127

29 CFR

1601.....73035
1604.....74676
1926.....75618
1952.....77000, 77001
1960.....77003
2601.....75208
2610.....75209, 75210, 75658

Proposed Rules:
2.....77047
402.....75231
403.....75231
1903.....75232
1910.....75238
1952.....77048
1977.....75232
2520.....74512, 74513, 74727, 74728
2530.....74512, 74513, 74727, 74728

30 CFR

250.....74471
715.....73945
783.....76932
816.....73945, 76932
817.....73945, 76932
890.....74680
904.....77003
925.....77017
943.....78635
950.....78637

Proposed Rules:
Ch. VII.....74513
100.....74444
884.....73512, 74943
914.....78482
938.....74943
948.....73512
950.....74728

31 CFR

Proposed Rules:
10.....73962

32 CFR

518.....73471
552.....73037
657.....73473
706.....76684
828.....73653
1900.....74919

Proposed Rules:
505.....73103
701.....76713

32A

Proposed Rules:
Ch. I.....78918
505.....78727

33 CFR

117.....73653, 75659, 77431-77433
150.....77434
161.....74471
207.....76144

Proposed Rules:
66.....73695
117.....77458

34 CFR

Subtitle A.....77368
Subtitle B.....77368

Proposed Rules:
Subtitle A.....75564
510.....78962
735.....73514
805.....73963

36 CFR

7.....78119
1150.....78472

Proposed Rules:
Ch. II.....75454
7.....73518, 77049

37 CFR

Proposed Rules:
Ch. I.....75225, 78918
1.....73657, 73965, 78172
5.....72653

38 CFR

3.....72654
21.....73479
36.....77028

Proposed Rules:
1.....77050
21.....77050

39 CFR

10.....72655
111.....73925
224.....74921
310.....77028
601.....73926

Proposed Rules:
10.....73103
111.....73518, 75710

40 CFR

35.....73868
52.....74472-74480, 75212, 75660, 76685, 76688, 78121, 78684
55.....73929
60.....74846, 75662
65.....73044
81.....73046, 73930, 78122
85.....78448
86.....78123
122.....74489, 74921, 76074, 76626, 76630
123.....76144
124.....74921
180.....75662, 75663, 76145, 76146, 77029, 77030, 78686, 78687
228.....77434
257.....76147
260.....76074, 76626
261.....74884, 76618, 76620, 77435, 78524-78540
262.....76620, 76624, 78524
264.....76074, 76626
265.....76074, 76626, 78524

Proposed Rules:
Ch. I.....75488
7.....77459
35.....72984
51.....73696
52.....74515-74520, 74737, 74944, 76496, 76714, 77052-77054, 77075, 77459, 77464, 77465, 78730-78734
55.....73699, 75710
60.....73521, 76404, 76427, 77075, 78174, 78980
61.....76346
81.....73702, 76209
122.....76076
123.....74520, 74737, 74945, 75240, 75241, 76210, 76715
162.....73523, 77077
163.....72708, 72948
164.....73523
172.....72948
180.....72708, 76211, 77077-77079
228.....75241
249.....76906
256.....73440, 76497
257.....72709
260.....76076
261.....74893, 77466
264.....76076
265.....76076
266.....76076
403.....72883
423.....72713
720.....74378, 74945
721.....78970
772.....77332, 77353

41 CFR

Ch. 4.....75454
Ch. 101.....73050, 77436
3-1.....74921

3-3.....73049
5-11.....76438
5A-11.....76438
7-1.....74923
7-4.....74923
7-6.....74923
Ch. 18.....78125
24-1.....73657
101-11.....74924
101-37.....73049

Proposed Rules:
Ch. 3.....73523
Ch. 25.....76716
51-4.....77080
51-5.....77080
101-6.....73977
101-20.....72713
105-60.....72714

42 CFR

5.....75996
57.....73051
58.....73658-73664
74.....76148
110.....77031
401.....74906
405.....73930, 73931, 74826, 75243

Proposed Rules:
Ch. I.....78735
36.....76497
53.....76212
57.....76212
74.....73978, 74174
121.....78552
405.....73978, 74174
447.....73978

43 CFR

4.....75212
3300.....77437
3610.....77438
3800.....78902

Public Land Orders:
5756 (Corrected by PLO 5770).....74485
5762 (Corrected by PLO 5772).....75214
5768.....73668
5769.....73480
5770.....74485
5771.....75214
5772.....75214
5773.....75214
5774.....74722
5775.....75664, 78134
5777.....78688

44 CFR

2.....74926
64.....72658-72661, 74926, 77031
67.....73668-73681
302.....74927

Proposed Rules:
59.....78181
60.....78181
61.....78181
62.....78181
64.....78181
67.....73703, 73704, 77081, 77091, 77092

45 CFR

Ch. I.....77368
Ch. XIII.....77368
Ch. XIV.....77368
Ch. XV.....77368
76.....77439
306.....74485
1061.....73054, 73890, 74928
1075.....74928
1391.....73059

Proposed Rules:
Ch. VI.....76716
Ch. X.....73709
121q.....77032
205.....75243
1223.....74521

46 CFR

4.....77439
26.....77439
35.....77439
78.....77439
97.....77439
109.....77439
167.....77439
185.....77439
196.....77439
276.....77445
500.....78688

Proposed Rules:
Ch. II.....75225, 78918
Ch. III.....78918
10.....73616
30.....75712
35.....75712
93.....74523
157.....73616
505.....74931
530.....75244
540.....74931

47 CFR

2.....78689, 78696
73.....78696, 78697
74.....78689
78.....78689
61.....76148
63.....76148
73.....72662, 73059, 74946 78134-78136
76.....76178
81.....76179

Proposed Rules:
Ch. I.....72719, 76498, 78188
1.....72902, 78736
2.....72723, 73979
21.....72723
22.....73979
63.....74523
67.....76213
73.....72902, 73618-73720, 73980, 76717, 78188-78191, 78735-78738
74.....72723
90.....73979, 77093
94.....72723

49 CFR

3.....75666
171.....74640
172.....74640
173.....74640
174.....74640
175.....74640
176.....74640
177.....74640
225.....72664
391.....77466
392.....77466
1011.....73076
1014.....78140
1031A.....72665
1033.....73076, 74486, 74723, 75215, 78140
1039.....73481
1040.....75667
1100.....73683
1109.....73077
1111.....74488, 77032
1121.....78141
1300.....73481, 75667
1303.....75667
1306.....75667
1308.....75667
1310.....75667

Proposed Rules:
Ch. X.....73105, 73524
1003.....76718
1005.....76718
1042.....75717
1056.....76718
1057.....73981
1109.....73105, 73106
1116.....76502
1128.....73106
1201.....76718, 78191
1241.....76718, 78191
1310.....76718
1322.....76718

50 CFR

13.....78153
17.....74880, 78153
216.....73486, 75215
258.....72667
611.....77445
656.....77445
671.....72667, 73077
672.....73486

Proposed Rules:
Ch. II.....75225, 78918
Ch. IV.....78918
Ch. VI.....75225, 78918
17.....76012
23.....73876
285.....78738
611.....74178, 74524, 74948, 77489
642.....74950
653.....73528
656.....77489
658.....74178
674.....74951
675.....74524
681.....74951

AGENCY PUBLICATION ON ASSIGNED DAYS OF THE WEEK

The following agencies have agreed to publish all documents on two assigned days of the week (Monday/Thursday or Tuesday/Friday). This is a voluntary program. (See OFR NOTICE FR 32914, August 6, 1976.)

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
DOT/SECRETARY	USDA/ASCS		DOT/SECRETARY	USDA/ASCS
DOT/COAST GUARD	USDA/FNS		DOT/COAST GUARD	USDA/FNS
DOT/FAA	USDA/FSQS		DOT/FAA	USDA/FSQS
DOT/FHWA	USDA/REA		DOT/FHWA	USDA/REA
DOT/FRA	MSPB/OPM		DOT/FRA	MSPB/OPM
DOT/NHTSA	LABOR		DOT/NHTSA	LABOR
DOT/RSPA	HHS/FDA		DOT/RSPA	HHS/FDA
DOT/SLSDC			DOT/SLSDC	
DOT/UMTA			DOT/UMTA	
CSA			CSA	

Documents normally scheduled for publication on a day that will be a Federal holiday will be published the next work day following the holiday.
Comments on this program are still invited.
Comments should be submitted to the Day-of-the-Week Program Coordinator, Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Service, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C. 20408

NOTE: As of September 2, 1980, documents from the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, will no longer be assigned to the Tuesday/Friday publication schedule.

REMINDERS

The "reminders" below identify documents that appeared in issues of the **Federal Register** 15 days or more ago. Inclusion or exclusion from this list has no legal significance.

Rules Going Into Effect Today

COMMERCE DEPARTMENT

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—

71357 10–28–80 / Atlantic butterfish fishery; implementation of management plan

Deadlines for Comments On Proposed Rules for the Week of November 30 through December 6, 1980

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation—

64588 9–30–80 / Pea Crop Insurance regulations; comments by 12–1–80

Food and Nutrition Service—

65932 10–3–80 / Food Stamps; performance reporting and sanction/incentive system; comments by 12–3–80

Food Safety and Quality Service—

71364 10–28–80 / Polychlorinated biphenyls in food, feed, agricultural pesticide and fertilizer facilities; comments by 12–4–80

Rural Electrification Administration—

64596 9–30–80 / Revision of REA Bulletin 181–3; accounting interpretations for rural electric borrowers; comments by 12–1–80

Soil Conservation Service—

65603 10–3–80 / Small Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act; intent to review regulations, policies and procedures; comments by 12–1–80

ALASKA NATURAL GAS TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, OFFICE OF FEDERAL INSPECTOR

73081 11–4–80 / Reimbursement of costs from sponsoring companies; comments by 12–4–80

ARTS AND HUMANITIES NATIONAL FOUNDATION

65635 10–3–80 / Employers part-time career employment; comments by 11–30–80

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

71365 10–28–80 / Airlines filing tariffs stating prices as maximum amounts; comments by 12–1–80

73086 11–4–80 / Classification and exemption of air taxi operators; comments by 12–4–80

COMMERCE DEPARTMENT

Census Bureau—

65250 10–2–80 / Miscellaneous amendments to the Foreign Trade Statistics Regulations; comments by 12–1–80
[Corrected at 45 FR 68965, 10–17–80]

Maritime Administration—

66167 10–6–80 / Research and development grant and cooperative agreements regulations; comments by 12–5–80

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—

64996 10–1–80 / Atlantic groundfish fishery; comments by 12–1–80

65641 10–3–80 / Foreign fishing in the Northern Pacific Ocean and Bering Sea; catch documentation and reporting procedures; comments by 12–2–80

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

Army Department—

73103 11–4–80 / Privacy Act systems of records; amendment of exemption rule; comments by 12–4–80

Engineers Corps—

62732 9–19–80 / Amendment of regulations for controlling certain activities in waters of the United States; comments by 12–1–80

70511 10–24–80 / Florida navigation locks regulations; comments by 11–30–80

National Security Agency—

71373 10–28–80 / Privacy Act systems of records; exemption rules; comments by 12–1–80

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Office of the Secretary—

73514 11–5–80 / Minority Institution Science Improvement Program (MISIP); grant regulations; comments by 12–5–80

ENERGY DEPARTMENT

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission—

74505 11–10–80 / Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978; alternative fuel price ceilings for incremental pricing; comments by 12–5–80

73692 11–6–80 / Treatment under the incremental pricing program of natural gas used as boiler fuel to raise steam which forms an integral step in the manufacturing process for fertilizer, agricultural chemicals, animal feed, and food; comment period extended to 12–1–80

[Originally published at 45 FR 13122, 2–28–80]

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

72708 11–3–80 / Acephate; proposed tolerance in or on mint hay; comments by 12–3–80

72221 10–31–80 / Air programs, Idaho; primary nonferrous smelter order to Bunker Hill Co.; comments by 12–1–80

72219 10–31–80 / Air quality implementation plan, Idaho; control of sulfur dioxide emissions from Bunker Hill Co. lead and zinc smelter; comments by 12–1–80

65630 10–3–80 / Air quality implementation plan, Missouri, approval, promulgation, and designation of areas; comments by 12–2–80

69271 10–20–80 / California, air quality; sulfur-dioxide nonattainment area boundaries for Kern County; comment period extended to 12–1–80

[*See also* 45 FR 55231, 8–19–80 and 45 FR 60931, 9–15–80]

72217 10–31–80 / Consideration of Ohio Implementation Plan revision; comments by 12–1–80

73440 11–4–80 / Guidelines for development and implementation of State solid waste management plans; comments by 12–4–80

60929 9–15–80 / Implementation of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act; comments by 11–30–80

62851 9–22–80 / Importation of motor vehicles and motor vehicle engines; comments by 12–3–80

70917 10–27–80 / Michigan air quality implementation plan; comment period extended to 11–30–80

[*See also* 45 FR 59329, 9–9–80]

70287 10–23–80 / Oklahoma; Submission for approval of interim authorization plan, Phase I, hazardous waste management plan; comments by 12–2–80

65633 10–3–80 / Pesticide use violations; procedures governing rescission of State primary enforcement responsibility; comments by 12–2–80

65633 10–3–80 / Pesticide use violations; rescission of States' primary enforcement responsibility; comments by 12–2–80

71364 10–28–80 / Polychlorinated biphenyls in food, feed, agricultural pesticide and fertilizer facilities; comments by 12–4–80

65262 10–2–80 / Receipt of revision to Lake, Great Basin Unified, Modoc, Imperial and San Bernardino Air Pollution Control Districts; comments by 12–1–80

72215 10–31–80 / Request for comments on deadline for remedying of conditionally approved portions of Ohio State Implementation plan; comments by 12–1–80

73520 11–5–80 / Revision of the Delaware State Implementation Plan; comments by 12–5–80

68403 10–15–80 / Rulemaking petition to require that generators and transporters of small quantities of hazardous waste comply with manifest, packaging, labeling and recordkeeping requirements; comments by 12–1–80

72709 11–3–80 / Solid waste disposal facilities and practices, criteria for classification; comments by 12–3–80

64856 9–30–80 / State implementation plans; approval of 1982 ozone and carbon monoxide plan revisions for areas needing an attainment date extension; comments by 12–1–80

71818 10–30–80 / State Solid Waste Management Plans, guidelines for development and implementation; comments by 12–1–80

73601 11–5–80 / Strychnine; preliminary notice of determination concluding the rebuttable presumption against registration of pesticide products; availability of position document; comments by 12–5–80

72232 10–31–80 / Water pollution; ink formulating; point source category effluent limitations guidelines; comments by 12–1–80

72232 10–31–80 / Water pollution; paint formulating; point source category effluent limitations guidelines; comments by 12–1–80

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

37468 6–3–80 / Availability of additional FM frequencies and modification of procedures used in assigning such channels; reply comments by 12–1–80

[*See also* 45 FR 17602, 3–19–80 and 45 FR 26390, 4–18–80]

63516 9–25–80 / Conversion of radiation patterns for AM Broadcast Stations; reply comments by 12–2–80

69499 10–21–80 / FM broadcast station in Alliance, Nebr.; proposed changes in tables of assignments; comments by 12–2–80

69502 10–21–80 / FM broadcast station in Hilton Head Island, S.C.; proposed changes in table of assignments; comments by 12–2–80

69501 10–21–80 / TV broadcast stations in Madisonville, Owensboro and Princeton, Ky., proposed changes in tables of assignments; comments by 12–2–80

69497 10–21–80 / TV broadcast station in Rio Grande City, Tex.; proposed changes in table of assignments; comments by 12–2–80

64981 10–1–80 / TV broadcast station in Santa Barbara, Calif.; changes in table of assignments; reply comments by 12–5–80

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

66798 10–7–80 / Graduated payment adjustable mortgage; comments by 12–1–80

66801 10–8–80 / Shared appreciation mortgage; comments by 12–1–80

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

65255 10–2–80 / Darworth Co.; consent agreement with analysis to aid public comment; comments by 12–1–80

65252 10–2–80 / Murata Manufacturing Co., Ltd.; consent agreement with analysis to aid public comment; comments by 12–1–80

[Corrected at 45 FR 67360, 10–10–80]

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

National Archives and Records Service—

64978 10–1–80 / Records management; stationery standards; comments by 12–1–80

HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT

Food and Drug Administration—

65619 10–3–80 / Medical devices; labeling and restrictions to assure safe and effective use; comments by 12–2–80

71364 10–28–80 / Polychlorinated biphenyls in food, feed, agricultural pesticide and fertilizer facilities; comments by 12–4–80

Health Care Financing Administration—

71821 10–30–80 / Medicaid program; deeming of income between spouses; comments by 12–1–80

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Office of the Secretary—

73272 11–4–80 / Section 8 and Section 23 Housing Assistance Payments Program; amendment of fair market rent schedules for existing housing; comments by 12–3–80

65258 10–2–80 / Siting of HUD-assisted project in locations with marginal or unacceptable air quality; comments by 12–1–80

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

Fish and Wildlife Service—

58171 9–2–80 / Endangered and threatened wildlife; review of three southeastern fishes; comments by 12–1–80

Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service—

65179 10–6–80 / Energy conservation by recipients of Federal assistance; comments by 12–5–80

Indian Affairs Bureau—

72699 11–3–80 / Accounting procedures, internal; Indian moneys, proceeds of labor and special deposits; comments by 12–3–80

Land Management Bureau—

68506 10–15–80 / Grazing administration and trespass on public land; comments by 12–1–80

National Park Service—

73518 11–5–80 / Restrictions on consumption of alcoholic beverages within Valley Force National Historical Park; comments by 12–5–80

Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement Office—

74513 11–10–80 / Kansas regulatory program, resubmission; comments by 11–26–80

71816 10–30–80 / Surface coal mining reclamation operations, State or Federal programs; comments by 12–1–80

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Agency for International Development—

65258 10–2–80 / Review of collection of civil claims; comments by 12–1–80

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

73106 11–4–80 / Feeder railroad development program implementation; comments by 12–4–80

75717 11–17–80 / Gateway restrictions and circuitous route limitations, elimination; comments by 12–2–80

68696 10–16–80 / Procedures to permit carriers to reroute traffic automatically for 30 days when necessary for reason beyond carriers' control; comments by 12–1–80

67272 10–9–80 / Public forum on interstate motor carrier study, Washington, D.C. (open), 11–25–80

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

Drug Enforcement Administration—

64572 9–30–80 / Exempt chemical preparation containing controlled substances; comments by 12–1–80

MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET OFFICE

Federal Procurement Policy Office—

65640 10–3–80 / Federal acquisition regulations; safeguarding classified information in industry, contractor team arrangements, and defense production and research and development pools; comments by 12–3–80

LABOR DEPARTMENT

Labor Management Standards Enforcement Office—

65926 10–3–80 / Labor organizations; election enforcement procedures; comments by 12–2–80

PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION

65259 10–2–80 / Allocation of residual assets; comments by 12–1–80

PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT OFFICE

65603 10–3–80 / Political participation by Federal employees in local elections; partial exemption from Hatch Act restrictions for residents of New Carrollton, Md.; comments by 12–2–80

POSTAL SERVICE

73518 11–5–80 / Domestic Mail Manual; definition of the terms "newspaper" and "periodical publication"; comments by 12–4–80

73103 11–4–80 / International express mail rates to Argentina; comments by 12–4–80

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

71776 10–30–80 / Debt securities, establishing ceiling limitations on the amount; comments by 11–30–80

74505 11–10–80 / Financial and Operational Combined Uniform Single ("FOCUS") Report; revision of form and filing requirements; comment period extended to 11–30–80

[*See also* 45 FR 62092 9–18–80]

71811 10–30–80 / Report of sales of securities; comments by 12–5–80

72685 11–3–80 / Securities resales; amount limitation, manner of sale and notice requirements; lessening of restrictions; comments by 12–1–80

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

66174 10–6–80 / Proposed business loan policy; comments by 12–5–80

TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT

Federal Highway Administration—

74040 11–13–80 / Bikeway design and construction criteria; comment period extended from 11–3–80 to 12–3–80

[*See also* 45 FR 51720, 8–4–80]

51625 8–4–80 / Consideration of revision of regulations for transportation of migrant workers; comments by 12–2–80

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration—

70202 10–23–80 / Highway safety innovative project grants program; comments by 12–1–80

Research and Special Programs Administration—

69272 10–20–80 / Hazardous materials; withdrawal of certain Bureau of Explosives authority delegations and miscellaneous amendments; comments by 12–5–80

Urban Mass Transportation Administration—

56742 8–25–80 / Section 5 operation assistance regulations, comments by 12–1–80

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms Bureau—

69240 10–20–80 / Distilled Spirits Tax Revision Act of 1979, implementation; comment period extended to 12–1–80

[*See also* 44 FR 71612, 12–11–79 and 45 FR 54087, 8–14–80]

Customs Service—

64601 9–30–80 / Importation of motor vehicles and motor vehicle engines under the Clean Air Act; comments by 12–3–80

Deadlines for Comments On Proposed Rules for the Week of December 7 through December 13, 1980

ACTION

74521 11–10–80 / Volunteer payments and services; treatment by governmental program; comments by 12–10–80

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service—

67307 10–10–80 / Export livestock; addition to lists of ports of embarkation for animals; comments by 12–9–80

67052 10–9–80 / Veterinary Services policy and procedures in cooperative programs concerning the eradication of Exotic Newcastle Disease from populations of birds including poultry; comments by 12–8–80

Commodity Credit Corporation—

66471 10–7–80 / 1981 Crop Flaxseed Price Support Propram; comments by 12–8–80

Federal Grain Inspection Service—

70425 10–23–80 / Elimination of mandatory requirements for inbound weighing of grain at export elevators; comments by 12–8–80

Food and Nutrition Service—

66447 10–7–80 / Special supplemental food program for women, infants, and children; comments by 12–8–80

74384 11–7–80 / Summer food service for children; comments by 12–7–80

Rural Electrification Administration—

66472 10–7–80 / Architectural services contract; proposed revision to REA form 220; comments by 12–8–80

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

66473 10–7–80 / Air carriers; removal of certificate restrictions; reply comments by 12–8–70

63500 9–25–80 / Charters; use of insurance policies to satisfy financial security requirements and use of letters of credit as an arrangement for protecting charter passengers' payments; reply comments by 12–9–80

67357 10–10–80 / Small communities; guidelines for increasing essential service by certified airlines; comments by 12–9–80

COMMERCE DEPARTMENT

Economic Development Administration—

67062 10–9–80 / Clarification of requirements concerning certain types of projects which EDA may fund under the Public Works and Development Facilities Program; final rule; comments by 12–8–80

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—

66460 10–7–80 / Emergency regulations modifying threatened sea turtle resuscitation procedures; comments by 12–8–80

ENERGY DEPARTMENT

Conservation and Solar Energy Office—

66632 10–7–80 / Federal Energy Management and Planning Programs; Methodology and Procedures for Life Cycle Cost Analyses (Average Fuel Costs); comments by 12–8–80

Economic Regulatory Administration—

67355 10–10–80 / Motor gasoline; retailer price rule and fixed cents per gallon markups; comments by 12–9–80

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

67564 10–10–80 / Air programs ambient air quality monitoring data reporting & surveillance provisions for lead; comments by 12–9–80

74518 11–10–80 / Air quality, Louisiana; volatile organic compound emissions in designated nonattaintment areas, comments by 12–10–80

74516 11–10–80 / Air quality, New Mexico; approval of implementation plan, nonattaintment areas; comments by 12–10–80

74515 11–10–80 / Air quality, North Carolina; approval of implementation plan, 1979 CO revisions; comments by 12–10–80

73976 11–7–80 / Availability for review of Arizona's Hazardous Waste Management Program Phase I interim authorization application; comments by 12–11–80

73977 11–7–80 / Availability for review of California's application for interim authorization of Plan I of its Hazardous Waste Management Program; comments by 12–9–80

73972 11–7–80 / Consideration of Ohio State Implementation Plan for carbon monoixde and ozone; comments by 12–8–80

73969 11–7–80 / Consideration of revision to Ohio State Implementation Plan; comments by 12–8–80

74737 11–12–80 / Implementation plan revision relating to Georgia Power Plant, Harllee Branch; comments by 12–12–80

66736 10–7–80 / Pesticide Programs data call-in; initiation of pilot program; comments by 12–8–80

73975 11–7–80 / Proposed alternative Ohio State Implementation Plan compliance schedule for a power plant in Coshocton, Ohio; comments by 12–8–80

73521 11–5–80 / Standards of performance for new stationary sources; organic solvent cleaners; comments by 12–8–80

[*See also* 45 FR 39766, 6–11–80 and 45 FR 56373, 8–25–80]

68328 10–14–80 / Steam Electric Power Generating Point Source Category; pollutant discharge limitations; comments by 12–9–80

73521 11–5–80 / Vermont application for interim authorization, Phase I; Hazardous Waste Management Program; comments by 12–10–80

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

59351 9–9–80 / AM stereophonic broadcasting; comments by 12–9–80

63011 9–23–80 / Cable television systems and postponement of divestiture requirement; comments by 12–8–80

71628 10–20–80 / Changes in the corporate structure and operations of COMSAT; comments by 12–12–80

64991 10–1–80 / FM broadcast stations in Bath and Hammondsport, N.Y.; changes in table of assignments; reply comments by 12–10–80

64993 10–1–80 / FM station in Blairsville, Pa.; changes in table of assignments; reply comments by by 12–10–80

64984 10–1–80 / FM broadcast stations in Brookville and Versailles, Ind.; changes in table of assignments; reply comments by 12–10–80

63533 9–25–80 / FM Broadcast Station's in Casper, Wyo.; changes in table of assignments; reply comments by 12–8–80

64994 10–1–80 / FM broadcast station's in Denison, Tex.; changes in table of assignments; reply comments by 12–10–80

63532 9–25–80 / FM Broadcast Station's in Farmville and Appomattox, Va.; changes in table of assignments; reply comments by 12–8–80

64988 10–1–80 / FM broadcast stations in Hastings, Nebr.; changes in table of assignments; reply comments by 12–10–80

64985 10–1–80 / FM broadcast station's in Hays, Kans.; changes in table of assignments; reply comments by 12–10–80

63531 9–25–80 / FM broadcast station in Madras, Oreg.; changes in table of assignments; reply comments by 12–8–80

63530 9–25–80 / FM broadcast station in Munising, Mich.; changes in table of assignments; reply comments by 12–8–80

64990 10–1–80 / FM broadcast station in McCook, Nebr.; changes in table of assignments; reply comments by 12–10–80

64981 10–1–80 / FM broadcast station in Visalia, Calif.; changes in table of assignments; reply comments by 12–10–80

76717 11–20–80 / FM quadraphonic broadcasting; comments period extended to 12–10–80

[Originally published at 45 FR 55491, 8–20–80]

65639 10–3–80 / Maritime radio services; public coast stations operating on frequencies below 27,500 kHz, establishment limitation removed; comments by 12–10–80

74523 11–10–80 / MTS and WATS market structure; interstate telecommunications services; Alaska submarket; comments by 12–8–80 and 12–10–80

[*See also* 45 FR 55777, 8–21–80 and 45 FR 61646, 9–17–80]

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

76498 11–19–80 / Overseas communications services regulations; comments by 12–12–80

65637 10–3–80 / Radio stations, table of assignments; FM broadcast station in International Falls, Minn.; reply comments by 12–8–80

64987 10–1–80 / TV broadcast station in Paintsville, Ky.; changes in table of assignments; reply comments by 12–10–80

64983 10–1–80 / TV broadcast station in Fort Pierce, Fla.; changes in table of assignments; reply comments by 12–10–80

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

75244 11–14–80 / Status of bulk commodities; comments by 12–12–80

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

71575 10–29–80 / Securities of member State banks; comments by 12–12–80

HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT

Food and Drug Administration—

59540 9–9–80 / Establishment of conditions under which over-the-counter (OTC) anthelmintic drugs products, which destroy pinworms, are generally recognized as safe and effective and not misbranded; comments by 12–8–80

[Corrected at 45 FR 65609, 10–3–80]

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

Fish and Wildlife Service—

59909 9–11–80 / Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants; proposal to determine "Isotria medealoides" (small whorled pagonia) to be an endangered species; comments from Governors of affected States by 12–10–80

Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement Office—

67361 10–10–80 / Oklahoma; permanent program submission under the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977; comments by 12–9–80

67372 10–10–80 / Tennessee, permanent program submission under the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977; comments by 12–9–80

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

70030 10–22–80 / Elimination of Annual Report Form TCS for motor carriers of property; comments by 12–8–80

76718 11–20–80 / Motor common carriers of household goods; operational rules; comments on or before 12–11–80

74488 11–10–80 / Railroad consolidation procedures, time revisions; comments by 12–10–80

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

75224 11–14–80 / Share accounts and share certificate accounts; comments by 12–10–80

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

76446 11–19–80 / Action plan developed as a result of the Three Mile Island accidents; comments by 12–12–80

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

74493 11–10–80 / Application review fees; comments by 12–8–80

70874 10–27–80 / Technetium-99 and low-enriched uranium as residual contamination in smelted alloys; exemption and licensing requirements; comments by 12–11–80

70166 10–22–80 / Utility Management and Technical Resources; Report NUREG/CR–1656; comments by 12–8–80

POSTAL SERVICE

38419 6–9–80 / Poisons and controlled substances—nonmailability; comments by 12–8–80

[*See also* 45 FR 20118, 3–27–80 and 45 FR 26983, 4–22–80]

TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT

Coast Guard—

70918 10–27–80 / Tankships; hatch covers on cargo tanks; comments by 12–11–80

70920 10–27–80 / Uninspected vessels of 200 gross tons or more, removal of affirmative minimum manning requirement; comments by 12–11–80

Federal Aviation Administration—

67283 10–9–80 / Flight crewmember flight and duty time limitations and rest requirements; comment period extended to 12–10–80

[*See also* 44 FR 53316, Aug. 11, 1980]

67100 10–9–80 / Petition for rulemaking of Rosenbalm Aviation, Inc. to exempt large, cargo-only aircraft from installing ozone control equipment or using ozone avoidance procedures; comments by 12–10–80

Urban Mass Transportation Administration—

60306 9–11–80 / Project management procedures for grantees; comments by 12–8–80

70412 10–23–80 / Urban initiatives program; comments by 12–8–80

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Internal Revenue Service—

67360 10–10–80 / Income tax; definition of a private foundation; comments by 12–9–80

Next Week's Meetings

ACTUARIES, JOINT BOARD FOR THE ENROLLMENT

74094 11–7–80 / Advisory Committee on Actuarial Examinations, Washington, D.C. (closed), 12–2–80

AGING FEDERAL COUNCIL

74048 11–7–80 / Washington, D.C. (open), 12–1 through 12–3–80

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

Forest Service—

74953 11–13–80 / State and Private Forestry Advisory Committee, Washington, D.C., (open), 12–4 and 12–5–80

Science and Education Administration—

74525 11–10–80 / Committee of Nine, New Orleans, La. (open), 12–4–80

ARTS AND HUMANITIES, NATIONAL FOUNDATION

75025 11–13–80 / Dance Panel, Washington, D.C., (partially open), 12–4 and 12–5–80

75026 11–13–80 / Expansion Arts Panel (Summer Projects and Tour Events), Washington, D.C., (closed), 12–1 through 12–3–80

75369 11–14–80 / Humanities Panel, Washington, D.C. (closed), 12–1 through 12–5–80

76276 11–18–80 / Humanities Panel Meetings, Washington, D.C., (closed), 12–3 through 12–5–80

75026 11–13–80 / Literature Panel (Literary Magazines and Small Presses), Washington, D.C., 12–5 and 12–6–80 Media Arts Panel (Production: Radio), Washington, D.C., (partially open), 12–1 and 12–2–80

75026 11–13–80 / Media Arts Panel (Production: Radio), Wash., D.C. (closed), 12–1 and 12–2–80

76275 11–18–80 / Music Panel (Jazz Section), Washington, D.C., (closed), 12–5 and 12–6–80

75026 11–13–80 / Office for Partnership Panel (State Programs), Washington, D.C., (partially open), 12–3 through 12–5–80

75026 11–13–80 / Special Projects Panel (Folk Arts), Washington, D.C., (partially open), 12–6 through 12–9–80

75027 11–13–80 / Visual Arts Panel (Artists Spaces, Ongoing Workshops), Washington, D.C., (closed), 12–3 through 12–6–80

CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION

74953 11–13–80 / Colorado Advisory Committee, Longmont, Colo. (open), 12–2–80

COMMERCE DEPARTMENT

International Trade Administration—

75251 11–14–80 / Electronic Instrumentation Technical Advisory Committee, Washington, D.C. (partially open), 12–2–80

75252 11–14–80 / Management-Labor and Importers and Retailers' Textile Advisory Committees, Washington, D.C. (open), 12–3–80

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—

74958 11–13–80 / Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council, Jacksonville Beach, Fla., (open), 12–3–80

74958 11–13–80 / Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic Fishery Management Councils, Jacksonville Beach, Fla. (open), 12–1 and 12–2–80

COMMERCE DEPARTMENT

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—

75732 11–17–80 / Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council, Scientific and Statistical Committee, Philadelphia, Pa. (open), 12–3–80

74744 11–12–80 / New England Fishery Management Council, Danvers, Mass. (open), 12–3–80

74951 11–13–80 / North Pacific Fishery Management Council; High Seas Salmon Fishery Management Plan; proposed amendments and regulations for 1981 season, Renton, Wash., 12–6–80 Anchorage, Alaska (open), 12–9–80

[*See also* 45 FR 70525–70526, 10–24–80]

75732 11–17–80 / Pacific Fishery Management Council and its Scientific and Statistical Committee, Sacramento, Calif (partially open), 12–2 through 12–4–80

National Telecommunications and Information Administration—

72243 10–31–80 / Public Telecommunications Facilities Program, Grant Appeals Board, Washington, D.C. (open), 12–5–80

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

76504 11–19–80 / State Jurisdiction and Responsibilities under the Commodity Exchange Act Advisory Committee, Washington, D.C. (open), 12–4–80

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

72781 11–3–80 / Indoor Air Quality Research Needs, Leesburg, Va. (open), 12–3 through 12–5–80

76505 11–19–80 / Product Safety Advisory Council, Washington, D.C. (open), 12–4 and 12–5–80

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

Army Department—

75273 11–14–80 / Army Medical Research and Development Advisory Panel Ad Hoc Study Group on Blood Products and Preservation, San Francisco, Calif. (partially open), 12–5–80

75273 11–14–80 / National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, Executive Committee, Washington, D.C. (open), 12–5–80

74747 11–12–80 / ROTC Affairs Advisory Panel, Washington, D.C. (open), 12–2–80

Engineers Corps—

75273 11–14–80 / Chief of Engineers Environmental Advisory Board, Atlanta, Ga. (open), 12–2 through 12–5–80

Office of the Secretary—

70303 10–23–80 / DoD Advisory Group on Electron Devices Advisory Committee, Culver City and Pasadena, Calif. (closed), 12–1 through 12–3–80

73120 11–4–80 / Science Board Task Force on EMP Hardening of Aircraft, Arlington, Va. (closed), 12–3 and 12–4–80

70039 10–22–80 / Wage Committee, Washington, D.C. (closed), 12–2–80

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

76223 11–18–80 / Education of Disadvantaged Children National Advisory Council, (open), 12–3 and 12–4–80

ENERGY DEPARTMENT

69541 10–21–80 / National Petroleum Council, Arctic Oil and Gas Resources, Coordinating Subcommittee, Dallas, Tex. (open), 12–5–80

73729 11–6–80 / National Petroleum Council, Arctic Oil and Gas Resources Committee, Environmental Protection Task Group, Los Angeles Calif. (open), 12–3–80

ENERGY DEPARTMENT

70041 10–22–80 / National Petroleum Council, Exploration Task Group of the Committee on Arctic Oil and Gas Resources, San Francisco, Calif. (open), 12–2–80

72781 11–3–80 / Indoor Air Quality Research Needs, Leesburg, Va. (open), 12–3 through 12–5–80

Economic Regulatory Administration—

74749 11–12–80 / Mt. Tom Generating Station, Unit 1; scoping meeting, Holyoke, Mass. (open), 12–4–80

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission—

76746 11–20–80 / Revision of Rules of Practice and Procedure Advisory Committee, Review of Hearing Procedures Subcommittee, Washington, D.C. (open), 12–1–80

[*See also* 45 FR 70077, 10–22–80]

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

63912 9–26–80 / Gene-Tox Program, Conference, Washington, D.C. (open), 12–3 through 12–5–80

72781 11–3–80 / Indoor Air Quality Research Needs, Leesburg, Va. (Open), 12–3 through 12–5–80

73133 11–4–80 / National Air Pollution Control Techniques Advisory Committee, Raleigh, N.C. (open), 12–2 and 12–3–80

74772 11–12–80 / Science Advisory Board, Toxic Substances Subcommittee, Washington, D.C. (open), 12–2 and 12–3–80

73539 11–5–80 / Science Advisory Board, Technology Assessment and Pollution Control Committee, (closed), Washington, D.C., 12–2–80

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

73849 11–6–80 / Meeting, Washington, D.C. (open), 12–1, 12–2, and 12–3–80

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

National Archives and Records Service—

74996 11–13–80 / Preservation Advisory Committee, Steering Subcommittee, New York, N.Y., (open), 12–4–80

HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT

Alcohol, Drug, Abuse, and Mental Health Administration—

74776 11–12–80 / Mental Health National Advisory Council, Rockville, Md. (open), 12–1 and 12–2–80

Food and Drug Administration—

75324 11–14–80 / Cardiovascular and Renal Drugs Advisory Committee, Rockville, Md. (open), 12–1 and 12–2–80

75325 11–14–80 / Radiopharmaceutical Drugs Advisory Committee, Rockville, Md. (open), 12–4 and 12–5–80

65676 10–3–80 / Technical Electronic Product Radiation Safety Standards Committee, Rockville, Md. (open), 12–3 and 12–4–80

Human Development Services Office—

75238, 75328 11–14–80 / White House Conference on Aging, Technical Committee, Washington, D.C. (open), 12–1 and 12–2–80 (2 documents)

76516 11–19–80 / White House Conference on Aging, Technical Committee on Employment, Washington, D.C. (open), 12–3 and 12–4–80

76516 11–19–80 / White House Conference on Aging, Technical Committee on Family, Social Services and other Support Systems, Washington, D.C. (open), 12–5 and 12–6–80

National Institutes of Health—

74064 11–7–80 / Board of Scientific Counselors of the National Eye Institute, Bethesda, Md. (partially open), 12–1–80

68466 10–15–80 / General Clinical Research Centers Committee, Bethesda, Md. (open and closed), 12–1 and 12–2–80

74063 11–7–80 / Large Bowel and Pancreatic Cancer Review Committee, Bethesda, Md. (partially open), 12–4 and 12–5–80

74063 11–7–80 / Microbiology and Infectious Diseases Advisory Committee, Bethesda, Md. (partially open), 12–4–80

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

72781 11–3–80 / Indoor Air Quality Research Needs, Leesburg, Va. (open), 12–3 through 12–5–80

IMMIGRATION AND REFUGEE POLICY, SELECT COMMISSION

75825 11–17–80 / Meeting, Irvington, Va. (closed), 12–5 and 12–6–80

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

Land Management Bureau—

71437 10–28–80 / Carson City District Grazing Advisory Board, Yerington, Nev. (open), 12–3–80

65049 10–1–80 / Fairbanks District Advisory Council, Ft. Wainwright, Alaska (open), 12–2–80

71688 10–29–80 / Grazing Advisory Board, Ely, Nev. (open), 12–3–80

71437 10–28–80 / Lakeview District Advisory Council, Lakeview, Oregon (open), 12–2–80

73807 11–6–80 / Las Cruces District Advisory Council, Las Cruces, N. Mex. (open), 12–4–80

73808 11–6–80 / Outer Continental Shelf Advisory Board, Alaska Regional Technical working Group Committee, Anchorage, Alaska (open), 12–4 and 12–5–80

73802 11–6–80 / Roswell District Advisory Council, Roswell, N. Mex. (open), 12–2–80

73808 11–6–80 / Socorro District Advisory Council, N. Mex., 12–3 and 12–4–80

National Park Service—

72299 10–31–80 / Cape Cod National Seashore; off-road vehicle use, availability of management analysis alternatives, Boston, Mass., 12–1–80, Eastham, Mass., 12–2–80 (both sessions open)

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Agency for International Development—

76552 11–19–80 / International Food and Agricultural Development Board, Washington, D.C. (open), 12–5–80

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

74797 11–12–80 / Aeronautics Advisory Committee, Informal Advisory Subcommittee, Hampton, Va. (open), 12–2 and 12–3–80

74797 11–12–80 / NASA Advisory Council, Subcommittee on Aviation Safety, Moffett Field, Calif. (open) 12–2 and 12–3–80

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Ocean Science Advisory Committee, Review of the Biological Investigations of Hydrothermal Vents, Ad Hoc Subcommittee, Washington, D.C. (closed), 12–1 and 12–2–80

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

76305 11–18–80 / Procedures and Administration Subcommittee, Washington, D.C. (open), 12–3–80

76556 11–19–80 / Reactor Safeguards Advisory Committee, Subcommittee on NRC Reactor Safety Research Program, Washington, D.C. (partially closed), 12–3–80

76305 11–18–80 / Reliability and Probabilistic Assessment, Subcommittee, Washington, D.C. (open), 12–3–80

OCEANS AND ATMOSPHERE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

76555 11–19–80 / Meeting, Washington, D.C. (partially closed), 12–4 and 12–5–80

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH, NATIONAL INSTITUTE

72781 11–3–80 / Indoor Air Quality Research Needs, Leesburg, Va. (open), 12–3 through 12–5–80

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

74803 11–12–80 / Small and Minority Business Ownership Advisory Committee, Las Vegas, Nev. (open), 12–5–80

SOCIAL SECURITY NATIONAL COMMISSION

76555 11–19–80 / Meeting, Washington, D.C. (open), 12–4 through 12–6–80

STATE DEPARTMENT

75413 11–14–80 / International Investment, Technology, and Development Advisory Committee, Washington, D.C. (open), 12–2–80

76564 11–19–80 / Private International Law Committee, Study Group on International Child Abduction, San Francisco, Calif. (open), 12–6–80

TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT

Federal Aviation Administration—

75826 11–17–80 / Hazardous materials safety, Silver Spring, Md. (open), 12–3 through 12–5–80

70365 10–23–80 / High Altitude Pollution Program Scientific Advisory Committee, Washington, D.C. (open), 12–3 through 12–5–80

75040 11–13–80 / Radio Technical Commission for Aeronautics (RTCA) Special Committee 139 on Airborne Equipment Standards for Microwave Landing System (MLS), Washington, D.C. (open), 12–3 through 12–5–80

Federal Highway Administration—

75828 11–17–80 / National Advisory Committee on Outdoor Advertising and Motorist Information, Chicago, Ill. (open), 12–4 and 12–5–80

Federal Railroad Administration—

70366 10–23–80 / Locomotive test program, Washington, D.C., 12–3–80

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration—

59245 9–8–80 / Automotive fuel economy contracts' coordination meeting, Arlington, Va., 12–1 and 12–2–80

Next Week's Public Hearings

COMMERCE DEPARTMENT

National Oceanic and Atmosphere Administration—

67404 10–10–80 / North Pacific Fishery Management Canal, Renton, Wash. and Kodiak, Alaska, 12–6–80

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION

76018 11–17–80 / Coal and wood burning appliances; performance provisions and technical data supplied to consumer, Washington, D.C., 12–2–80

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

Navy Department—

68704 10–16–80 / Navy Discharge Review Board, Atlanta, Ga., New Orleans, La.; and Tampa, Fla.; 12–1 thru 12–6–80

60468 9–12–80 / Naval Discharge Review Board: Atlanta, Ga., New Orleans, La., and Tampa, Fla., 12–1 through 12–15–80

ENERGY DEPARTMENT

71498 10–28–80 / Coordinated State Grant Programs, San Francisco, Calif., 12–3 and 12–4–80

72733 11–3–80 / Medium Btu Industrial fuel gas demonstration project Memphis, Tenn., 12–3–80

Economic Regulatory Administration—

70968 10–27–80 / Designing methods for distributing petroleum during a shortage and selecting standby distribution mechanisms, Washington, D.C., 12–2–80

[*See also* 45 FR 63909, 9–26–80]

76214 11–18–80 / Petroleum allocation and price regulations; crude oil entitlements, domestic price control access, Wash., D.C.

[First published at 45 FR 72552, 10–31–80]

74494 11–10–80 / Retailer price rule for motor gasoline, San Fransico, Calif., 12–2–80

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

72702 11–3–80 / Interstate air pollution abatement; sulfur dioxide within the N.Y.-N.J.-Conn. metropolitan area; New York, N.Y. 12–3 and 12–4–80

73521 11–5–80 / Vermont application for interim authorization, Phase I; Hazardous Waste Management Program, Montpelier, Vermont, 12–5–80

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

Fish and Wildlife Service—

68886 10–16–80 / Proposal to determine Borax Lake Chub to be an endangered Species and Borax Lake, Harney Co., Oregon to be its critical habitat, Burns, Oregon, 12–2–80

70198 10–22–80 / Proposed determination of critical habitat for the Hawksbill Sea Turtle in Puerto Rico, Puerto Rico, 12–2 through 12–4–80

70192 10–22–80 / Proposed listing with endangered status and critical habitat for the Monito Gecko, Puerto Rico, 12–2 and 12–3–80

Land Management Bureau—

74074 11–7–80 / Consideration of draft environmental impact statement on Energy Transportation Systems Inc., Various cities in La., Ark., and Okla., 12–1, 12–3 and 12–4–80

Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement Office—

73512 11–5–80 / Abandoned Mine Lands Reclamation Program, Charleston, W. Va, 12–4–80

71371 10–28–80 / Abandoned Mine Lands Reclamation Program, Zanesvile, Ohio, 12–1–80

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

70159 10–12–80 / Peanuts, shelled or not shelled, blanched, or otherwise prepared or preserved (except peanut butter), Washington, D.C., 12–1–80

LABOR DEPARTMENT

Pension & Welfare Benefit Programs Office—

74512 11–10–80 / Multiple employer pension plans; individual benefit reporting and recordkeeping; Washington, D.C. 12–4–80

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

73832 11–6–80 / Pipeline accident investigation, Edgewood, Ky., 12–2–80

NAVAJO AND HOPI INDIAN RELOCATION COMMISSION

76710 11–20–80 / Life estate leases, Rocky Ridge, Ariz., 12–6–80

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

72371 10–31–80 / Houston Lighting & Power Co. (Allens Creek Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 1), environmental matters, Houston, Tex., 12–2 and (if necessary) 12–3–80

TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT

Federal Railroad Administration—

73847 11–6–80 / Consolidated Rail Corp. (Amtrak), 11–6–80 changed to 12–2–80

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Internal Revenue Service—

65625 10–3–80 / Investment credit for energy property, Washington, D.C., 12–4–80

List of Public Laws

Note: No public bills which have become law were received by the Office of the Federal Register for inclusion in today's **List of Public Laws.** A complete cumulative listing through Public Law 96.483 was published in the Reader Aids section of the issue of Wednesday, November 5, 1980.

Last Current Listing October 24, 1980

Documents Relating to Federal Grant Programs

This is a list of documents relating to Federal grant programs which were published in the **Federal Register** during the previous week.

DEADLINES FOR COMMENTS ON PROPOSED RULES

77036 11–21–80 / USDA/FmHA—Community facility loans and development grants for community domestic water and waste disposal systems; comments by 1–21–81

76701 11–20–80 / WRC—Protection and management of historic and cultural environment; comments by 1–12–81

APPLICATIONS DEADLINES

75731 11–17–80 / Commerce/MBDA—Management and technical assistance projects in San Francisco, apply by 12–18–80

77112 11–21–80 / ED—Minority Institutions Science Improvement Program (MISIP); apply by 1–30 and 3–2–81

76505 11–19–80 / ED—Organizational Processes in Education; apply by 12–11–80 or 4–9–81

75746 11–17–80 / ED—Women's Educational Equity Act Program, development of educational material and model programs; apply by 1–27–81

77139 11–21–80 / HHS/HDSO—Aging program, research development projects; apply by 1–23–81

77144 11–21–80 / HHS/Secretary—Poverty Research Center, grant applications; apply by 1–30–81

76534 11–19–80 / HUD/CPD—Community Development Block Grant Program; extension to 11–3–80 of submission dates for preapplications for Pittsburgh, Pa.

OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST

76517 11–19–80 / HHS/Sec'y—Technical assistance demonstration grants and contracts; delegation of authority

76716 11–20–80 / NSF—Improving Government regulations; semiannual regulations agenda

THE FEDERAL REGISTER: WHAT IT IS AND HOW TO USE IT

FOR: Any person who uses the Federal Register and Code of Federal Regulations.

WHO: The Office of the Federal Register.

WHAT: Free public briefings (approximately 2½ hours) to present:

1. The regulatory process, with a focus on the Federal Register system and the public's role in the development of regulations.
2. The relationship between Federal Register and the Code of Federal Regulations.
3. The important elements of typical Federal Register documents.
4. An introduction to the finding aids of the FR/CFR system.

WHY: To provide the public with access to information necessary to research Federal agency regulations which directly affect them, as part of the General Services Administration's efforts to encourage public participation in Government actions. There will be no discussion of specific agency regulations.

WHEN: December 5 and 19, January 16 and 30; at 9 a.m. (identical sessions).

WHERE: Office of the Federal Register, Room 9409, 1100 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

RESERVATIONS: Call King Banks, Workshop Coordinator, 202–523–5235.